

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLVIII

JANUARY, 1933

Number 1

---

## THE BUTLER-OXENDEN CORRESPONDENCE

A hitherto unpublished letter by Samuel Butler has recently come to light. The original was probably destroyed shortly after its receipt, but a copy has been preserved in the letter-books of Sir George Oxenden,<sup>1</sup> Butler's correspondent. This letter would be interesting regardless of any intrinsic value it possessed, for the reason that only two of Butler's letters have previously been known.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The correspondence presented below is from the *Oxenden Papers*, vol. xi (British Museum Add. MS. 40706), and vol. xvi (Add. MS. 40711). Since the *Oxenden Papers* are as yet uncatalogued, I should never have run across them had it not been for the extreme kindness of Mr. Francis Wormald, Assistant Superintendent of the Manuscript Room in the British Museum, who, learning of my interest in Butler, not only called my attention to the *Papers* but turned over to me his own notes, of invaluable assistance in working out the history of the Oxenden family.

<sup>2</sup> Both of these are in Add. MS. 32625 in the British Museum. One, from Butler to his sister concerning the education of her son, has been printed by Lamar (*Butler's Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose*, 399). The other is the following, written to some friend and benefactor (Add. MS. 32625, f. 1 r) :

Deare S<sup>r</sup>:

I am very Sensible of the exceedinge great fauour I receiud from you by your lres to M<sup>r</sup> Bernard, wherein you are pleased to let me know, I haue the happiness to liue in yo<sup>r</sup> memorie, then w<sup>ch</sup> nothinge but (that w<sup>ch</sup> came w<sup>th</sup> it) the knowledge of yo<sup>r</sup> health & Safety, could haue beeene more dearely welcome to mee, But I am further obligd to you for yo<sup>r</sup> kinde concernment & care of my good Successe w<sup>ch</sup> indeed S<sup>r</sup> I shall euer belieue I owe rathur to the good wishes of such excellent persons as yo<sup>r</sup> selfe then any desert or industrie of mine owne. I beseech you commend my most humble seruice to yo<sup>r</sup> noble father, & if you doe not thinke yo<sup>r</sup> last fauour wise placed, for bringinge you this trouble, indeed S<sup>r</sup> there is no man

Fortunately, the letter is in itself of some importance, especially as the Oxenden letter-books disclose additional material relating to Butler. The result is that a direct if momentary light is cast upon the author of *Hudibras*, and as all who have attempted to penetrate the darkness that has settled over his life will testify, any light however fleeting is welcome here.

The records of the East India Company show that in 1632 there went out to India in attendance on the Reverend Arthur Hatch one George Oxenden, then a boy of twelve.<sup>3</sup> In India, in the service of the Company, Oxenden was to spend the greater part of his life. He rose steadily. Thrice he returned to England. Regarding these visits home the Company records are quite definite. On the first occasion Oxenden sailed in 1639, was reengaged by the Company in 1641, and promptly returned to India.<sup>4</sup> The second time, he made the passage back in the *Smyrna Merchant*, which sailed in January, 1653,<sup>5</sup> and went out again on the same vessel in 1656.<sup>6</sup> The third time, he came home in the *King Fernandez*, which sailed from Surat on January 10, 1659;<sup>7</sup> on October 25, 1661, Oxenden was appointed President of the Company;<sup>8</sup> on November 24 of the same year he was knighted;<sup>9</sup> about the end of March, 1662, he sailed for India for the last time, on the *Richard and Martha*, which anchored in Swally Hole September 19, 1662.<sup>10</sup> The new President lived seven years thereafter, dying in India July 14, 1669.<sup>11</sup> It was during these last seven years that Sir George received and wrote the letters which now concern us, copies of which were entered by his clerks in his letter-books covering this last period of his life.

Sir George, the third of five sons, came of an old Kentish family, his father being Sir James Oxenden of Dene, Kent. Sir George had at least one sister, Elizabeth, the wife of William

liuinge, to whom the knowledge of yo<sup>r</sup> happinesse (when you shall please to think me worthy of it) can be more really welcome then to

Yo<sup>r</sup> most affectionate  
& faythfull seruant

S. Butler

Jun y 28d

<sup>3</sup> Sir William Foster, *The English Factories in India*, IV, 326, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 23, note.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 92.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 142, 149.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 92.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 203.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 93.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 203.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, XIII, 182.

Dallison, and two cousins, Henry Oxenden the poet and the poet's brother, Lieutenant Colonel Richard Oxenden.<sup>12</sup> Particularly lively was the correspondence which Sir George kept up with his sister Elizabeth and his cousin Richard, for both of whom it appears he had deep affection. He writes them of Company matters and family affairs at home; their letters are filled with gossip and the confusing details of family litigation. All of these things, one would have said, are impossibly remote from Samuel Butler. Yet it is into the midst of just these matters that Butler strays.

For Sir George's two faithful correspondents at home, his sister Elizabeth and his cousin Richard, the announcement in London of a sailing for India meant days spent in packing gifts and writing letters. In March, 1663, they had news of such a sailing and they bestirred themselves accordingly. On March 22 Elizabeth writes her brother,<sup>13</sup> and again on April 1,<sup>14</sup> when she remarks: "I haue sent you a pipe of y<sup>e</sup> best Sacke procurable, y<sup>t</sup> & a good Spanish Tobacco w<sup>th</sup> exelent good Virginia & some bookees . . ." On April 3 she writes twice.<sup>15</sup> In still another letter, this of April 6,<sup>16</sup> she refers again to the gifts she is sending: "I haue sent you some Burds & some Sacks & Tobaco & a beaver hatt, & some Bookes for a token of my Loue. . . ."

Now, among these books, twice mentioned, it seems that there was a copy of the first part of *Hudibras*, recently published. This along with other matters, we learn from Richard Oxenden's letter of March 30:<sup>17</sup>

. . . Sr amongst some bookees y<sup>t</sup> you will receaue from yr sister Dalyson there is one named Hudibrase w<sup>th</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> most admired peece of Drollary y<sup>t</sup> ever came forth it was made by o<sup>r</sup> Old acquaintance Mr Butler whome we did use to meeet in Grasenn Walkes hee did use to keepe Compt w<sup>th</sup> Ned Kelke & Collonel Malthuse & Dr Morgin & Mr Willm Morgin I onely write this for feare yor multiplicity of Businesse should cause you to forgett him

<sup>12</sup> On the Oxendens (also spelt Oxinden) cf. "Extracts from a Seventeenth Century Note-Book" in *The Genealogist* (New Series, 111), 38-41; on the Dallisons (also Dalyson) cf. Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 5520 (*Genealogy and Pedigrees . . . Kent*), f. 103.

<sup>13</sup> Add. MS. 40711 (*Oxenden Papers*, xvi), f. 18r.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 38r-41r.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 42v-44r.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 50v-51v.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 34r and v.

4 MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, JANUARY, 1933

& yt you may y<sup>e</sup> Better understand his Booke hee sends you these Inclosed lines w<sup>th</sup> ye presentation of his service. . . .

What Richard refers to as "these Inclosed lines" turns out to be the following long letter.<sup>18</sup>

Sr

Yor worthy kinsman & my hond Freind Collonell Oxinden hath ingaged me to give you this trouble, for he Intending to present you w<sup>th</sup> a Trifle of mine, a booke lately Printed here, has beene please to desire me to give you a short Acco<sup>t</sup> of it, It was written not long before y<sup>e</sup> time, when I had first yt hon<sup>r</sup> to be Acquainted w<sup>th</sup> you, & Hudibras whose name it bears was a West Countrey Kn<sup>t</sup> then a Coll: in the Parliament Army & a Com<sup>t</sup> man, with whome I became Acquainted lodging in y<sup>e</sup> same house w<sup>th</sup> him in Holbourne I found his humor soe pleasant yt I know not how I fell into y<sup>e</sup> way of Scribbling w<sup>ch</sup> I was never Guilty of before noe since, I did my indeav<sup>r</sup> to render his Character as like as I could, w<sup>ch</sup> all yt know him say is soe right yt they found him out by it at y<sup>e</sup> first view, For his Esq<sup>r</sup> Ralpho he was his Clerk & an Independ<sup>t</sup>, between whom, & y<sup>e</sup> Kn<sup>t</sup>, there fell out Such perpetual disputes about Religion, as you will find up & downe in y<sup>e</sup> Booke for as neere as I could I sett downe theire very words, As for y<sup>e</sup> Story I had it from y<sup>e</sup> Kn<sup>t</sup>s owne Mouth, & is so farr from being feign'd, yt it is upon record, for there was a srite of law upon it betweene y<sup>e</sup> Kn<sup>t</sup>, & y<sup>e</sup> Fidler, in w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Kn<sup>t</sup> was overthrowne to his great shame, & discontent, for w<sup>ch</sup> he left y<sup>e</sup> Countrey & came up to Settle at London; The other persons as Orsin a Beareward, Talgot a Butcher, Magnane a Tinker, Cerdon a Cobler, Colon a Clowne &c: are such as Commonly make up Bearebaittings though some curious witts pretend to discouer ceartaine persons of quallity w<sup>th</sup> whome they say those Characters agree, but since I doe not know who they are I cannot tell you till I see theire commentaries but am content (since I cannot helpe it) yt everyman should make what applications he pleases of it, either to himselfe or others, Butt I Assure you my cheife designe was onely to give y<sup>e</sup> world a Just Acco<sup>t</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> Ridiculous folly & Knavery of y<sup>e</sup> Presbyterian & Independent Factions then in power & whether I have performed it well or noe I cannot tell, onely I have had y<sup>e</sup> good fortune to have it Genlly esteemed soe especially by y<sup>e</sup> King & y<sup>e</sup> best of his Subjects, it had y<sup>e</sup> Ill fortune to be printed when I was Absent from this Towne whereby many Mistakes were committed, but I have corrected this booke w<sup>ch</sup> you will receive my Selfe, w<sup>th</sup> w<sup>th</sup> Sr I send you y<sup>e</sup> best wishes and Reall Affections of

Yor Humble & Faithfull

Serv<sup>t</sup> Sam: Butler

London March y<sup>e</sup> 19th

1662

3

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 13v-14r.

## THE BUTLER-OXENDEN CORRESPONDENCE 5

At this point in the surviving correspondence Butler leaves as abruptly as he entered. Two years pass. Then, under date of March 6, 1665, we find two letters of Sir George's in which Butler again appears. The first of these,<sup>19</sup> addressed to Richard, "my most deare & Loueing Cosine," contains the following passage.

I am obliged to those many freinds whose goodness retained the memory of mee, I hope y<sup>t</sup> God will bless mee yet once againe to see my native Country when I shall repay them all in their owne quoine & giue Mun: Altum a flower for his flower, & for Mr Butler— I am beholding to him for y<sup>e</sup> 2: parte of Hudibrass, I haue in ciuillity answerd his Lre but mentioned noethinge to bee sent him, therefore anything of Aggott hafftes, Cornelian ringes or what else would bee acceptable to him, you would doe mee a fauour to desire my sister to furnish you w<sup>th</sup> what pleases y<sup>r</sup> fancy & present them in my name, & for excuse y<sup>t</sup> I did not thinke them worthy y<sup>e</sup> mentioning in his Lre.

Sir George's second letter of March 6, 1665, I give in full.<sup>20</sup>

Samll Butler

I esteemed it a great Favour reced at y<sup>r</sup> hands to have th honour of hearing from you now these two yeares successiuelly, y<sup>t</sup> the passed years I replied to in a few lines, rest onely this by Mr Thos Rolt who presented mee with y<sup>r</sup> kind token of the second parte of that pleasant history of y<sup>e</sup> Famous enterprise of y<sup>t</sup> valiant Knight Sr Hudibrass w<sup>th</sup> is noe less delightfull then y<sup>e</sup> first, my thinkes when I consid<sup>r</sup> the barreness of y<sup>e</sup> Theame it ressembles y<sup>e</sup> story of y<sup>e</sup> Cooke, pardon the homely Comparison, y<sup>t</sup> drest his masters boots and made good meate of them soe an Ingenious parson of a Fluent Fancy is able to doe any thinge.

Sr I should haue bine glade of the opportunity to express my obligacons to you in any ciuell respects to Mr Rolt, but hee is intended home in these returning shippes upon some differences y<sup>t</sup> have arrisen between y<sup>e</sup> late Presid<sup>t</sup> & y<sup>e</sup> East India Comp<sup>a</sup> wherein Mr Rolt is something conceard: which hee is of oppinion cann bett<sup>r</sup> cleare Verbally than at this distance with his penn, soe y<sup>t</sup> all y<sup>e</sup> seruice I cann doe you & him is to giue him a fauourable recommendation to y<sup>e</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> w<sup>th</sup> shall bee enlarged y<sup>e</sup> party himselfe being a sober discrete parson, & one y<sup>t</sup> deserues very well. I haue not farthr to trouble you with soe take leane to subscribe.

Yor verry Faithfull seru<sup>t</sup> to commd:

Geo: Oxinden

Surratt y<sup>e</sup> 6 March 1664

5

The most obvious question raised by the Butler-Oxenden letters

<sup>19</sup> Add. MS. 40706 (*Oxenden Papers, xi*), 110v-111r.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 116v.

is whether they fix the date of the composition of *Hudibras*, Part I. Though they suggest certain possibilities concerning this date, unfortunately they do not fix it with anything like finality. Butler writes to Sir George that *H.*, I, was written "not long before y<sup>e</sup> time when I had first y<sup>e</sup> hon<sup>r</sup> to be Acquainted w<sup>th</sup> you." Since Oxenden was in England during three periods, 1639-1641, 1653-1656, 1659-1662, Butler and Oxenden met first either in 1653-1656 or 1659-1662. The Butler-Oxenden letters strongly imply the latter period. Here Richard's letter of March 30, 1663, is the important one: "[*Hudibras*] was made by o<sup>r</sup> Old acquaintance M<sup>r</sup> Butler whom wee did use to mee in Grasenn Walkes hee did use to keepe Comp<sup>a</sup> w<sup>th</sup> Ned Kelke & Collonel Malthuse & D<sup>r</sup> Mordin & M<sup>r</sup> Will<sup>m</sup> Mordin I onely write this for feare yo<sup>r</sup> multiplicity of Busienesse should cause you to forgett him. . . ." If, as is here implied, the acquaintance between Butler and Sir George sprang up during Sir George's last visit home, they must have met between June, 1559, before which Sir George could not well have been in London,<sup>21</sup> and May 14, 1660, by which time Kelke was dead.<sup>22</sup> This would place the writing of *H.*, I, not long before the latter half of 1559. But since it is impossible to show that Butler and Oxenden did not meet during Oxenden's earlier visit home in 1653-1656, this conclusion cannot be insisted upon, while it will be rejected by those who accept Professor Craig's arguments that *H.*, I, was written between August 22, 1642, and August 17, 1648.<sup>23</sup> These arguments are that Part I refers to events before the death of the King; that it contains nothing to indicate that it was not written before the death of the King; and, finally, that Butler's own statement on the title page, "Written in the Time of the Late Wars," means written between Aug., 1642, and Aug., 1647.

<sup>21</sup> When Sir George went out to India for the last time, as stated above, he sailed the end of March, 1662, arriving September 19.

<sup>22</sup> Edward Kelke, "son and heir of Edward K., of Sandwich, Kent, gent.," was admitted to Gray's Inn Nov. 2, 1639 (Joseph Foster, *Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889*, 224). On May 14, 1660, Richard Oxenden wrote to his brother Henry: ". . . now for Dick Foggs frendly meeinge with me at London, I doe ashure you I neauer saw his face since my Deare freinde Ned Kelke was buried . . ." (Add. MSS. 28004 (*Family of Oxenden Correspondence*, VI), ff. 121-122).

<sup>23</sup> Hardin Craig, "*Hudibras*, Part I, and the Politics of 1647," in *Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), 145-155.

While Professor Craig has proved beyond any doubt that Part I refers throughout to the political situation before the King's death, the last two arguments are open to question. That the "Late Wars" was not always strictly interpreted in the 17th century is shown by Milton's explanation that he was recalled home from Italy by "the sad news of Civil War," and by the sub-title of *Behemoth*, "The History of The Causes of The Civil Wars of England, And of the Counsels and Artifices by which they were carried on, from the year 1640, to the year 1660," while the notes in Grey's *Hudibras* indicate a possibility that certain lines in Part I were written after the King's death.<sup>24</sup> If Professor Craig's last two arguments fall, the first, that Part I refers throughout to the political situation before the King's death, may stand without rendering 1659 untenable as the date of the composition of Part I.

The statements in the letters point, then, to a time shortly before 1653-1656 or 1659-1662 as the date of *H.*, I, and more strongly to the latter—if, that is, one is willing to accept Butler's statements at their face value. Butler's ingenuousness, though not unquestionable, it seems needless to discuss for this reason: the problem of the date of *H.*, I, cannot be made to depend upon a strict interpretation of Butler's statements. What does "writing" a poem mean? A close study of Butler's miscellaneous verses in Add. MSS. 32625 in the B. M. reveals much about Butler's method of composition. He was not a fluent writer. His wit found release first in the short paragraph of verse. Butler is at his best in the prose character, in the epigram, and in the case of his longer poems in the self-enclosed verse paragraph. The composition of the sustained narrative of *Hudibras* must have strained him to the utmost. Its composition undoubtedly extended over considerable periods. May not Butler have been referring in his letter to Oxenden to a redaction made some time around 1659 when at long last the turn of events was encouraging him to hope for the publication

<sup>24</sup> *Hudibras* (ed. Zachary Grey, Cambridge, 1744). Note on I, i, 549: "Walk, Knave, walk" may refer to Edmund Gayton's "Walk, Knaves, Walk; a discourse intended to have been spoken at Court. . . . By Hodge Tuberville, Chaplain to the late Lord Hewson," London, 1659. Note on I, i, 925-6: the reference may be to Richard Cromwell. Note on I, ii, 233-5: a possible reference to Sir Kenelm Digby's *Discourse concerning the cure of Wounds by Sympathy* (a second ed., 1658, is recorded in B. M. catalogue).

of his satire? With speculations of this sort one must be content, for the letters lead to no definite conclusions concerning the date of *H.*, I.

Regarding the original of Sir Hudibras, the Oxenden correspondence leads to a much more positive conclusion. It would appear that the man who served as model was Sir Henry Rosewell of Ford Abbey, Devonshire. Now, it has long been said that Butler had in mind one Sir Samuel Luke of Bedfordshire. Yet the earliest of Butler's biographers, Aubrey and Wood, make no reference to Sir Samuel. Precisely when his name was first associated with Hudibras cannot be determined. The author of the 1704 *Life* of Butler wrote that "our Author liv'd some time also with Sir Samuel Luke, who was of an ancient Family in Bedfordshire; but, to his Dishonour, an eminent Commander under the usurper Oliver Cromwell: and then it was, as I am inform'd, he composed this Loyal Poem. . ."<sup>25</sup> And in *An Alphabetical Key to Hudibras*, ascribed to Sir Roger L'Estrange, which appeared in Butler's *Posthumous Works* (1715), but which may have circulated before this, Hudibras is said to represent Sir Samuel Luke.<sup>26</sup> The article on Butler in the *General Dictionary* (1738), by John Lockman, repeats the story of Butler's residence with Sir Samuel and continues thus: "As Sir Samuel Luke is generally supposed to be shadowed under the character of Hudibras, it is very probable Mr. Butler might have received some disgust in that Knight's family. . ."<sup>27</sup> In a footnote Lockman suggests the name of Sir Samuel Luke to fill the gap in I, i, 904:<sup>28</sup>

'Tis sung there is a valiant Marmaluke,  
In foreign land yclep'd—  
To whom we have been oft compar'd. . . .

But he adds, "Whilst this sheet was at press, I was assured by Mr. Longueville that Sir Samuel Luke is not the person ridiculed under the name of *Hudibras*."<sup>29</sup> In the preface of his edition of *Hudibras* (1744), Grey discusses the matter at length: "It has

<sup>25</sup> "The Author's Life," in *Hudibras* (ed. Grey), p. v.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Craig, *Manly Anniversary Studies*, 145.

<sup>27</sup> Article on "Hudibras," in *A General Dictionary, Historical and Critical* (1738), vi, 290-291.

<sup>28</sup> So numbered in Grey's ed.

<sup>29</sup> *A Gen. Dict.*, vi, 291, note.

been suggested by a reverend and learned Person . . . That notwithstanding Sir *Samuel Luke* of *Wood-End* in the Parish of *Cople*, in *Bedfordshire*, has generally been reputed the Hero of this Poem; yet from the Circumstances of his being compared to Sir *Samuel Luke*, Part 1, Canto 1. line 906 & it is scarce probable, that he was intended, it being an uncommon thing to compare a Person to himself: that the Scene of Action was in *Western Clime*; whereas *Bedfordshire* is *North of London*; and that he was credibly inform'd by a *Bench*er of *Grays-Inn*, who had it from an Acquaintance of Mr. *Butler's*, that the Person intended, was Sir *Henry Rosewell* of *Ford-Abbey* in *Devonshire*. These indeed would be probable Reasons, to deprive *Bedfordshire* of its *Hero*, did not Mr. Butler in his *Memoirs* of 1649 give the same Description of Sir *Samuel Luke*; and in his *Dunstable Downs* expressly style *Sir Samuel Luke, Sir Hudibras.*<sup>30</sup> Since Grey's time the tendency has been to question the identification of *Hudibras* and Sir *Samuel*.<sup>31</sup>

Now, Butler's statement to Oxenden that "Hudibras . . . was a West Countrey Kn<sup>t</sup> then a Coll: in the Parliament Army & a Com<sup>te</sup> man" links up with the information coming from the bencher of Gray's Inn to the effect that "the Person intended, was Sir *Henry Rosewell* of *Ford-Abbey* in *Devonshire*." Since Butler's association with Gray's Inn is established by Richard's letter, one believes that the bencher knew whereof he was speaking.

Gray's final argument for Sir *Samuel Luke*, which he bases on the *Memoirs of 1649* and *Dunstable Downs*, is not sufficiently strong to countervail the combined statements of Butler and the bencher of Gray's Inn. True, the description of Sir *Samuel Luke* in the *Memoirs of 1649* closely resembles *Hudibras*; but such resemblance does not prove Grey's contention. The case for Sir *Henry Rosewell* is strengthened on further inquiry. *H.*, I, i, 665<sup>32</sup> fixes the scene: "In Western Clime there is a Town. . . ." On *white-pot* (i, 299) the following note is given in Grey: "This Dish is more peculiar to the County of *Devon*, than to any other, and on that account is commonly call'd *Devonshire white-pot*." Butler's own note on the passage in *H.*, II, ii, in which *Hudibras* boasts that he

<sup>30</sup> *Hudibras* (ed. Grey), Preface, p. iii.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Craig, *Manly Anniversary Studies*, 146.

<sup>32</sup> So numbered in Grey's ed.

has "been exchang'd for *Tubs of Ale*," is this: "The *Knight* was Kept prisoner in *Exeter*, and after several exchanges propos'd, but none accepted of, was at last releas'd for a Barrel of Ale, as he often us'd, upon all occasions, to declare."<sup>33</sup> Sir Henry Rosewel was appointed to the Committee for Devon by the Long Parliament October 18, 1644,<sup>34</sup> and four times thereafter was a Commissioner for Devon.<sup>35</sup>

In his letter to Oxenden Butler refers not only to Sir Hudibras but to five of the minor characters in the poem, Orsin, Talgol, Magnano, Cerdon, and Colon. Until recently the identifications of these five characters given in *An Alphabetical Key to Hudibras* and taken over by Grey in his edition have gone unquestioned: Orsin "hints at" one Joshua Goslin, who kept bears "at Paris-Garden on the Southwark side"; Talgol was a butcher in Newgate Market; Magnano was Simeon Waite, a tinker and Independent preacher; Cerdon, one-eyed Hewson, a cobbler; Colon "hints at" Ned Perry, a hostler.<sup>36</sup> These identifications have recently been questioned by Professor Craig, whose study of the political events shadowed forth in *H.*, I, has led him to the conclusion that the rabble of bear-baiters is "suggestive of the new model: and its leaders correspond roughly with the leaders of the army after the self-denying ordinance. . . ."<sup>37</sup> In place of the old key Professor Craig suggests the following one: Orsin hints at Prince Rupert, Talgol at Fairfax, Magnano at Skippon, Cerdon at Ireton, Colon at Cromwell.<sup>38</sup> Butler's own statement is this: "The other persons as Orsin a Beareward, Talgot a Butcher, Magnane a Tinker, Cerdon a Cobler, Colon a Clowne &c: are such as Commonly Make up Bearebaitings though some curious witts pretend to discouer certaine persons of quallity w<sup>th</sup> whome they say those characters agree, but since I doe not knowe who they are I cannot tell you till I see their commentaries but am content (since I cannot helpe it) y<sup>t</sup> everyone should make what applica-

<sup>33</sup> *Hudibras* (ed. A. R. Waller), 189.

<sup>34</sup> *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (Collected and ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait), I, 545.

<sup>35</sup> Appointed June 23, 1647, Feb. 16, 1648, April 7, 1649, Dec. 7, 1649 (*Acts and Ordinances*, I, 963; I, 1080; II, 32, II, 295).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Craig, *Manly Anniversary Studies*, 145-146.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 152-153.

## THE BUTLER-OXENDEN CORRESPONDENCE 11

cations he pleases of it, either to himselfe or others . . ." Whether Butler's disavowal is sincere or not it is impossible to determine, but this much is clear: the "commentators" of 1663, like Professor Craig, had persons of distinction in mind, and not, like the author of the *Alphabetical Key*, butchers, tinkers, and cobblers.

In the way of new biographical data the Butler-Oxenden letters have little to offer. Butler writes that *H.*, i, "had y<sup>e</sup> Ill fortune to be printed when [he] was Absent from this Towne whereby many mistakes were committed. . ." Part i was licensed and entered Nov. 11, 1662, and Pepys purchased a copy Dec. 26.<sup>39</sup> We know that from Jan. 1661 to Jan. 1662, Butler was Steward of Ludlow Castle for Richard Vaughan, Earl of Carberry, then Lord President of Wales,<sup>40</sup> but what was detaining Butler from London late in 1662, it is impossible to tell. Biographically, Richard Oxenden's letter is the more important, for it definitely associates Butler with Gray's Inn. In doing so it renders the more probable Aubrey's statement that Cleveland "and Sam. Butler, &c. of Grayes Inne, had a Clubb every night."<sup>41</sup> Further, it suggests possible acquaintance between Butler and two satirists of Gray's Inn not unlike him in temper, John Hall of Durham<sup>42</sup> and Richard's brother, the author of *Religionis Funus et Hypocritae Finis* (1647). Among the varied influences which played on Butler's mind, not the least, it seems, was that exerted by such wits of Gray's Inn.

RICARDO QUINTANA

*University of Wisconsin*

---

<sup>39</sup> *Hudibras* (ed. A. R. Waller), p. v.

<sup>40</sup> E. S. De Beer, "The Later Life of Samuel Butler" in *RES.*, iv (1928), 159-166.

<sup>41</sup> Aubrey, *Brief Lives* (ed. Andrew Clark), i, 175.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. R. Quintana, "John Hall of Durham and Samuel Butler: A Note" in *MLN.*, XLIV (1929), 176-179.

## THACKERAY AND FRIEDRICH VON HEYDEN

*Miss Shum's Husband*, a short story published in *Fraser's Magazine*, 1838, was later incorporated into Thackeray's *Yellowplush Correspondence*, where it is the first of the narratives told by the footman Charles Yellowplush:

Mr. Altamont, his master, has lodgings at Pentonville, in the house of Mr. and Mrs. Shum, whose family consists of twelve girls, namely four Misses Buckmaster, daughters of Mrs. Shum by her first husband; Mary, the daughter of Mr. Shum by his first wife; and seven younger girls, who are left nameless. Mr. Altamont only remains in the dingy and slovenly surroundings because he adores Mary, the Cinderella of the family. As the lodger is the chief source of the Shums' revenues, the Buckmaster girls naturally set their capes for him. Mr. Altamont, however, asks for the hand of Mary Shum, telling her father that he has 400 Pounds a year, and Mary, if she marries him, must share all that he has, without asking questions: only this will he say, that he is an honest man. Upon his marriage, Mr. Altamont takes a comfortable house, with three domestics, of whom Yellowplush is one. Every morning he goes to the City, returning late in the evening. His wife would have been perfectly happy, had not her family continued to urge her to discover her husband's secret. When the insinuation is made that he must be a bigamist, Mary falls into hysterics, just as her husband returns home. Mrs. Shum is ejected from Altamont's house, and forbidden ever to return, but Mr. Shum continues his frequent visits. During a drinking-bout of the two men, Altamont ineptly remarks: "I saw you twice in the City to-day, Mr. Shum." As the latter had been only to the Bank, taking the coach again immediately to return home, the family now has a good clue, and eventually the mother-in-law finds out that Altamont is the old man who sweeps the crossing from the Bank to the other side of Cornhill, receiving the alms of the passers-by for this service. Upon being discovered, Altamont makes arrangements to sell all his belongings, and with the 6000 Pounds thus realized he takes his wife and child permanently to the Continent. Some years later Yellowplush meets them at Baden-Baden, where they are much respected and pass for people of property.

The identical theme is treated in Friederich von Heyden's *Der graue John, Novelle*, first published in the *Berliner Conversations-Blatt für Poesie, Literatur und Kritik*, Vol. 3, July, 1829, Nos. 141, 142, 144-147.<sup>1</sup> In 1841 the *Novelle* was reprinted in von Heyden's *Randzeichnungen. Eine Sammlung von Novellen und Er-*

<sup>1</sup> Diesch, *Bibliographie der germanischen Zeitschriften*, No. 2097. An account of von Heyden's life and works may be found in Goedeke's *Grundriss*, vol. 10, pp. 291-297, our story being treated on pp. 294, 295.

*zählungen*, Vol. 1, pp. 387-444, and from here it passed over into Heyse and Kurz' *Deutscher Novellenschatz*, Vol. 13, pp. 177-231, where it is most readily accessible, as the *Conversations-Blatt* and the *Randzeichnungen* are rarely met with. A synopsis of *Der graue John* follows:

At the time of the Continental Blockade (1807) two young Germans one night rescue a tall man attacked by foot-pads in the suburbs of London. The man, whose face they do not get to see clearly, does not tell them anything more about himself except that his name is John; with the remark that they shall see him again, but without recognizing him, he suddenly disappears, leaving with them a valuable ring, as a memento. They notify the police of the occurrence, which is published in the newspapers. Soon after, while walking in a park on a Saturday afternoon, a gentleman greets them, inquiring whether their adventure with Grey John had had any bad results for them. When they inquire about Grey John, he replies that all London knows the repulsive beggar who sweeps the unpaved approach to the Exchange, now and then receiving a penny from a charitable person. The two Germans had often seen this beggar, without knowing his name, and they judge that he must be at least seventy, being at the same time hunch-backed, lame, crippled with rheumatism, and unable to stand without the aid of a crutch and of his broom. The young men continue walking with the gentleman, who introduces himself as John Williams, until they finally reach a village, several hours distant, where he invites them to spend the week-end with him. Until his villa, which he points out to them, is finished, he makes his home at the inn. For several months these week-end visits are repeated, and each time, on Monday morning, Mr. Williams leaves them in the park in which they had first met. Upon completion of his villa, Mr. Williams arranges a festival, at which his engagement to Betty Leads, the innkeeper's daughter, is announced. At the marriage, the villa, together with a considerable sum of money, is settled upon the bride. Williams continues to spend the first part of the week in London, returning to the village on Saturday afternoons. Betty promises never to attempt to discover the reason of his absence. Things continue thus for a year and more, but eventually the young wife, to whom friends insinuate that her husband may be a highwayman, or a pickpocket, is induced to follow him unobserved, and discovers him to be none other than Grey John, the lame and hunchbacked beggar at the Exchange. He makes his escape, and the young wife, vainly hoping that he may some day return, does not betray his secret. A benevolent society, which had been receiving considerable contributions anonymously, is informed by a letter from Grey John that this is to be his last contribution, and that the donor, not permitted to be even a beggar, must now, in obedience to his fate, go to the devil.

The reason for this educated man's life as a beggar is indicated in a story which Mr. Williams tells the two Germans: Robert, a clerk in the

service of a Jamaican planter, is sent to Boston, to collect a bad debt of considerable amount which had practically been charged off as hopeless. He is able to collect almost the entire amount, only to be accused by his employer of having pocketed the rest. In danger of arrest as an embezzler, he retains the collected money and makes his escape to the East Indies, where, in course of time, he becomes fabulously rich. A beggar whom he thrusts from his door reveals himself as his former employer, who demands that he return the stolen money, but dies before Robert can reply. Torn by remorse, he disposes of his fortune and disappears. At the end of the story we are left to infer that Grey John is Robert, trying to atone for his crime.

In an introductory paragraph to *Der graue John*<sup>2</sup> von Heyden makes this statement concerning his source:

Was in diesen Blättern niedergelegt wird, ist auch die Schilderung eines englischen Sonderlings, und eines solchen, der nicht nur wirklich gelebt hat, sondern auch heute noch leben mag. In einem Romane dürfte eine Begebenheit, wie die folgende, übertrieben und unnatürlich erscheinen, indem ein sehr zuverlässiger Freund hat ihr als Augenzeuge beigewohnt, und ich darf vertrauensvoll berichten, was er gesehen und zur Stelle vernommen.

In the Introduction to the *Randzeichnungen* (I, p. xvi) this statement is amplified:

Der Verfasser . . . hat oft nur Begebenheiten abgefaßt, die ihm als wirkliche Ergebnisse gelegentlich mitgetheilt worden, und diesen mehr oder weniger vom Seinigen zufügt. Der Inhalt der Novelle: "der graue John" weiset am wenigsten solche Zuthaten auf. Die Geschichte trug sich wirklich zu, wie sie erzählt ist. Ein würdiger Mann, dem die Gabe poetischer Erfindung ganz abgeht, und der heute noch lebt, hat, als unmittelbarer vertrauter Augenzeuge, jenen Begebenheiten beigewohnt. Diese erschienen so sonderbar, daß dem Drange sie niederzuschreiben, nachdem sie vertraulich mitgetheilt worden, nicht zu widerstehen war. Einiges ist freilich idealisiert.

In two places, accordingly, von Heyden asserts that the story was told him by an eyewitness, incapable of telling anything but a plain, unvarnished tale, and he expressly adds that this *Novelle* shows less of his own addition than any of the others contained in the *Randzeichnungen*. The editors of the *Deutscher Novellschatz* accept his statement, and I know of no reason why we should refuse to do so. It follows, then, that Thackeray, while reproducing

<sup>2</sup> *Berliner Conversations-Blatt* No. 141, repeated in *Randzeichnungen* I, 390.

the original theme, has chosen to substitute a happy ending, more in consonance with the comic tone that dominates his story. Whether Thackeray got the story from von Heyden, or from another account that might have been the common source of both, is difficult to decide: in the indices of the *London Times* of this period I found no clue. Furthermore, Thackeray was in Germany from the summer of 1830 to the fall of 1831, and it is not at all unlikely that some friend, perceiving that the story in the *Conversations-Blatt* played in London, should call his attention to it.

In conclusion, I may call attention to a third version of this theme, in Johanna Schopenhauer's *Bettler von Sankt Columba*:<sup>3</sup>

An old beggar who has for years had his station at the door of the Church of St. Columba in Cologne, prevents one of his patrons from committing suicide. It turns out that the young man, Gisbert Neumann by name, has gambled away a considerable sum belonging to his employer, who is about to return to Cologne. The beggar promises aid, and taking Gisbert to his home, shows him a hoard of gold, much more than sufficient to pay the young man's debt; he offers to give him this money on condition that Gisbert marry the beggar's daughter, who, as it turns out, is a beautiful and unspoiled young girl. In order that the identity of the girl may remain a secret, the marriage takes place in another town, with the beggar present, but not seen. The latter continues to solicit alms at the church, and has no communication with the young couple. It is the time of the French Revolution, and Gisbert eventually goes to Paris, amasses a fortune, and returns to Cologne with his wife: he has meanwhile changed his name, calling himself M. de Boisvert. The beggar had left Cologne immediately after the departure of his daughter and her husband, and she has had no news of her father for many years. Upon her return to Cologne, she tries to find out from the other beggars at St. Columba what has become of the old man, but without avail. One day, when she and her husband are on their way to a festival, she sees her father, who had been run down by a passing vehicle. She jumps out of the carriage, embraces her father, loudly calling his name, whilst her husband asks her not to make a scene by proclaiming the fact that the old beggar is her father. The latter dies in her arms. From documents found at his abode it appears that he had made a vow of some sort, to live and die a beggar.

While there is here a variation in the story, in that not the beggar, but his daughter is married, the fundamental theme re-

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Goedeke's *Grundriss*, 10, 295. The story appeared in Theodor Hell's *Penelope, Taschenbuch für das Jahr 1832*, and could therefore have been inspired by von Heyden, as far as time is concerned.

mains, as also the unhappy ending. Furthermore, here, as in von Heyden's story, the beggar had taken up this profession in consequence of a vow.

W. KURRELMEYER

---

BROWNING'S *THE RING AND THE BOOK* AND  
WASSERMANN'S *DER FALL MAURIZIUS*

It may be of interest to know that the technic used by Browning in his famous "murder case" has deeply influenced Jacob Wassermann in one of his best books, the *Fall Maurizius*. Like the Franceschini case, the Maurizius case is a case of the past which at the time of the opening of the book has been settled and forgotten. Both authors reopen the old case, Browning by using himself and Wassermann through one of his characters (Etzel). In the *Ring and the Book* Browning chances to find the *Old Yellow Book*, becomes interested and brings the Franceschini case to life again; in the *Fall Maurizius* Etzel Andergast chances to meet "the man with the seaman's cap," becomes interested and brings the Maurizius case to life again. Both find their first information in old documents, Browning in the *Old Yellow Book* and Etzel in the *Petitions for Pardon*. It is in the latter that we first become acquainted with the main circumstances of the case in a way not very different from the method used in the First Book of Browning's work. Like the First Book it appears in the first part of the story, gives us an idea of what the story is about and points out the fact that there are differences of opinions to which it briefly introduces us. In his *Petitions for Pardon* (including the newspapers and other written documents) Wassermann presents the dead skeleton of the case in much the same way as Browning does in his First Book. And by first presenting us with this lifeless skeleton of facts, Wassermann is following Browning's first step—he is giving us that part of his story which might well compare to the latter's "pure crude facts."

However, Wassermann like Browning does not leave us with only a knowledge of these. Like Browning he proceeds to breathe life into this skeleton by "mingling the soft gold with gold's alloy"—his imagination. This is done by giving us glimpses of

## BROWNING AND WASSERMANN 17

the soul, that entity which is absent from the cold facts as it is from the dead skeleton. For that reason Wassermann, like Browning, lets "the warm sun of fancy" play upon his characters and thereby brings them to life.

By bringing their characters to life, both authors let us look into these characters and let us see in them that which our particular vision allows us to see. In other words, neither Browning nor Wassermann has alloyed his imagination with the facts for the purpose of convincing us of one point of view. We are forced to draw our own conclusions. As in the *Ring and the Book*, the characters of the *Fall Maurizius* tell their own story in their own way and interpretation, and after each has told his tale, Wassermann steps back and leaves the final decision to rest with the reader. As "the acid slowly burns out the alloy," what is left is not the author's nor any one speaker's point of view but the reader's decision which is influenced by, and therefore based on, the sum total of all arguments and opinions given. To be sure, Wassermann has not confined each speaker to a separate division of his book as Browning does. There is no special "Book" in which one particular speaker says all that he has to say. Instead, there is a gradual unfolding of the plot through a great deal of interwinding. We hear a little of one part of the story from Maurizius and then a little of another part of the story from Andergast and then perhaps a different version of the whole affair from Waremme. Nevertheless, as interwoven as these characters and arguments are, the threads need but be unwound, and we find the same definite divisions as we have in the *Ring and the Book*.

FRANZ SCHNEIDER

*University of California, Berkeley*

---

## GOETHE AND HEINRICH VON KLEIST. A MISREPRESENTATION

The unfortunate relations between Goethe and Heinrich von Kleist have been discussed frequently by literary critics. Goethe's unfavorable comments on Kleist's *Amphitryon*, *Penthesilea* and *Der zerbrochene Krug*, as well as the circumstances attendant upon the Weimar production of the last named of these dramas, are too

well known to need repetition here. The same is true of the bitter epigrams which Kleist subsequently directed at Goethe in the *Phöbus*. But a recent biography<sup>1</sup> of Kleist does such violence to facts and to the character of Goethe as to demand refutation.

If merely the authentically documented data regarding Heinrich von Kleist's life were published, biographies of the great Prussian dramatist would be brief. Yet his enigmatic character and startling, tragic end have stimulated writers to give credence to much idle gossip and to unfounded rumors, which have been repeated without careful scrutiny. It is not surprising that authors of fanciful pseudo-biography should seize with avidity upon the life of an ill-starred, mysterious personage like Kleist. But it is unfortunate that thereby myths should be perpetuated, widely circulated, and grossly exaggerated. Granted that a biography in the form of a novel need not be expected to conform strictly to detailed facts, it is nevertheless deplorable to distort and disparage the character of a truly great man who failed to understand Kleist's personality and art. The authors of *La Vie de Henri de Kleist* have done a grave injustice to the memory of Goethe by attributing to him a malevolent desire to undermine the career of a contemporary poet.

In this biography Kleist's persistent misfortune and failure to win recognition are accounted for in large measure by the following diatribe:

Le crime de Kleist fut sans doute d'avoir déplu à l'illustissime, au tout-puissant qui régnait alors, du haut de son Olympe, sur les lettres du monde: Goethe.

Du jour où ces deux demi-dieux s'affronteront, ce sera la lutte sans merci. Le plus faible y laissera ses os (p. 67).

The nature of this war without quarter is set forth rancorously in the account of the Weimar presentation of Kleist's comedy *Der zerbrochene Krug*. Goethe is represented as filled with heightened animosity toward Kleist because the latter had become the protégé of Wieland. The authors of the biography invent a fanciful legend to the effect that Duke Karl August of Weimar had, at the instigation of Wieland, Rühle von Lilienstern and Ernst von Pfuel, expressed a desire to see the comedy staged. Goethe's reaction to this alleged proposal is couched in these words:

<sup>1</sup> *La Vie de Henri de Kleist*. Par Émilie et Georges Romieu. 8th ed. Paris, Gallimard, 1931.

Le premier mouvement de Goethe avait été de rendre son sceptre; mais à la réflexion, sans doute se dit-il qu'il pouvait beaucoup mieux faire. On voulait qu'il fit représenter la pièce de ce béjaune insolent: il allait d'abord la mettre au point, lui, Goethe; il allait "collaborer" avec Kleist (pp. 149 f.).

Goethe's unfortunate division of the comedy into three acts, and other changes are alleged to have been prompted by a vengeful desire to sabotage a play of merit. Moreover, the unsubstantiated gossip, that Goethe approved of the functionary who expressed his dislike of the comedy by whistling, is published as a valid fact (p. 151).

Of Goethe's comment on *Penthesilea*, a copy of which he had received from Kleist, the authors publish but a part, namely, that which is most critical. The opening and closing sentences, which soften the criticism somewhat, do not appear here (pp. 150 f.). Goethe is portrayed as "empourpré de colère" as he begins the reading of the tragedy (p. 150). No attempt is made to set forth the difference in Goethe's and Kleist's views on art, which gave rise to the former's shrinking from so vehement a portrayal of outraged sensibilities and of savage cruelty as is found in *Penthesilea*. Obviously enough, Goethe's chastened sense of beauty was rudely jolted by the excesses of unbridled passion in *Penthesilea*; such extremes must have seemed to transgress the boundaries of art and to lead back to the chaos from which German literature had but recently extricated itself.

Iffland's refusal to stage *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* in Berlin is claimed to have been inspired by Goethe (p. 171). The fact is that Iffland had been ruffled by attacks directed at him by Adam Müller, Kleist's fellow-editor of the *Berliner Abendblätter*.

The biography ends with the lament of Kleist's sister Ulrike, who accuses herself and Goethe of having killed Kleist. Never can she pardon him who has ruined her brother's literary career (p. 232). This accusation of Goethe by Ulrike is entirely unsubstantiated.

Passages, such as those cited above, do not represent a mere excursion into the realm of the fanciful, which may be condoned in the novel of biography; these distortions of facts result in vilification.

It is not surprising that Goethe should have failed to appreciate Kleist, who was misunderstood and neglected not merely during

his lifetime, but for decades after his death. By nature and by their views on art the two men were destined to remain apart. Had Kleist's *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and *Penthesilea* appeared during the early years of Goethe's Storm and Stress enthusiasm, they might have had a very different reception. But the Goethe of the first decade of the nineteenth century, whose views on esthetics had undergone so profound a change in the eighties of the preceding century, must have been as offended in his artistic sensibilities by these dramas as he was by the belated Storm and Stress products of Schiller. And literary history has convincingly recorded how difficult it was to effect a rapprochement between Goethe and Schiller even through personal contacts which were lacking in the case of Goethe and Kleist. In the young Prussian dramatist Goethe doubtless sensed a morbidity and lack of poise which were painful reminders of his own early experiences.

The truth of the matter is not that Goethe wilfully undermined Kleist, but rather that encouragement from the older poet might have sustained and comforted the unhappy dramatist when all the odds appeared to be against him. This view gains support from the solace and inspiration which Kleist drew from Wieland's praise of his *Robert Guiskard*. For in hours of discouragement and despair he read and re-read his benevolent old friend's words of commendation which spurred him on to renewed effort.

Sympathetic understanding and aid from Goethe would very probably have paved the way for recognition, and might have averted the crisis which resulted in Kleist's suicide. But to attribute Kleist's lack of outward success and his tragic death to malevolence on the part of Goethe is nothing short of calumny.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

*Ohio Wesleyan University*

---

#### GOETHE AND SCHNITZLER

We know that Arthur Schnitzler read certain writers; he said so. It is impossible for one poet to read another without being influenced. Very little has been done thus far by way of getting at Schnitzler's sources. We have been minded to feel that he was wholly Viennese and to assume that that settled the matter. This

is far too narrow. I have at present no thought of launching out into an investigation of this subject. It would be however a fruitful one; and Schnitzler, as the author of *Anatol* and *Reigen*, needs and deserves a Lessing-like "Rettung." Here I wish merely to emphasize the relation of *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* to Schnitzler.

In Schnitzler's story *Die dreifache Warnung*, the spirit had said to the youth: "Geh nicht durch diesen Wald, Jüngling, es sei denn, du wolltest einen Mord begehen." He goes through the woods and feels that he has conquered because he has not committed murder. But the spirit says to him later: "Dein achtloser Schritt hat einen Wurm zertreten." Some readers object to the argument.

There is a parallel to this in *Werther*, the style of which is not at all unlike that of Schnitzler's story. It is the famous letter of August 18, where Goethe makes the point that the earth from pole to pole is inhabited with living creatures—and we read: "Der harmloseste Spaziergang kostet tausend armen Würmchen das Leben, es zerrüttet ein Fusstritt die mühseligen Gebäude der Ameisen, und stampft eine kleine Welt in ein schmähliches Grab." The entire letter is relevant to Schnitzler but too long for quotation; and it is, or should be, one of the most familiar passages from Goethe.

Moreover, when Werther has finally made up his mind to take his life, he calls in his servant and gives him orders as to how his affairs are to be adjusted. Among these orders is this one: "Und einigen Armen, denen er wöchentlich etwas zu geben gewohnt war, ihr Zugeteiltes auf zwei Monate voraus zu bezahlen." This theme, with such modifications as epic strategy and economy demanded, re-occurs in Schnitzler's story entitled *Blumen*.

But all of this is relatively unimportant in comparison with the strangest parallel, possibly, in German literature: that between *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* and Schnitzler's *Leutnant Gustl*. At first, and without further consideration, a comparison of these two one-man tales would seem like a comparison of Thomas Mann with Wilhelm Busch, of Hegel with Jack London. There is no thought of working out the parallel here.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD

*West Virginia University*

**GOETHE'S TASSO, L. 2152: VIELLEICHT, VIELLEICHT  
AUCH NICHT.**

Isabella d'Este, the "First Lady of the Renaissance," great-aunt of Goethe's Duke Alphons, married into the Gonzaga family at Mantua. The family-device, *Forse che sì, forse che no*, occurs everywhere in her palace there, and was used by d'Annunzio as the title of his novel concerning her. Goethe must have studied the brilliant career of this most typical woman of the Ferrara house. May not the phrase be a faint reflection of "local color"?

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD

*Northwestern University*

---

**TWO UNPUBLISHED NOTES BY S. T. COLERIDGE**

As all students of Coleridge know, the books that contain his marginalia are most numerous, and new ones frequently come to light. Since Haney's Bibliography of Coleridge was published, which contains a list of such volumes, there have been many discoveries in that phase of his writings. It would be a considerable task to compile a thoroughly up-to-date catalogue of his marginalia, but such a work would have no small value.

Some time ago I found an entirely unrecorded Coleridge association book whose owner has very kindly permitted me to publish the manuscript notes. It is the one volume edition of Cowley's works, published in 1681. According to a note inserted by Edward Dowden, the book was bought by him at the sale of Wordsworth's library (the poet's signature is on the title page) at Rydal Mount in 1859.

In Cowley's Preface to the Miscellanies there are two notes by Coleridge. Cowley remarks<sup>1</sup> disparagingly on some of his youthful poems. But Coleridge evidently understood him to mean that he lightly regarded all of his Miscellany, for Coleridge wrote in the margin:

Strange that a respect for the subject of two of these poems viz—that on his Friend Harvey & the other on the Poet Crashaw, both funereal

---

<sup>1</sup> P. C2.

## CARDINAL NEWMAN'S LITERARY PREFERENCES 23

Poems, should not have preserved him from speaking in this manner. But there is here a deal of affection.

After he had read the Miscellany, however, he came to the following conclusion:

I have fallen into a mistake in the above. The contemptuous tone in which he spoke is not the one to apply to the whole *Miscellany* but only to the juvenile part of it. It gives me pleasure to have observed this & to correct the mistake in this manner rather than erase the Note.\*

Through the courtesy of its owner, I am able to publish for the first time Coleridge's note in his copy of Mandeville's "Fable of the Bees" (1772). Haney cites in his Bibliography another edition dated 1724, in which, he states, Coleridge has a note on the first fly-leaf, the same location of the one in the 1772 edition. As a 1724 edition was issued, he could have had both; but I am inclined to believe that there is an error in Haney's reference, and that the one before me is the only one possessed by Coleridge. The note is as follows:

If I could ever believe that Mandeville really meant anything more by his Fable of the Bees etc (than) a bonne bouche of solemn raillery I'd like to ask those man shaped apes who've taken up his suggestions in earnest and seriously maintained them as a basis for a *rational* act of man and the world how they explain the existence of those cheats, those superior charlatans the legislators & philosophers who have known how to play to(o) well upon the Peacock like Vanity & Follies of their fellow mortals.

S. T. Coleridge (Signed)

*Columbia University*

WARREN E. GIBBS

---

## CARDINAL NEWMAN'S LITERARY PREFERENCES

It is extremely difficult to find any direct mention of Cardinal Newman's favorite authors in anything that has been published of his. Newman's personal library at the Birmingham Oratory, where he passed the last thirty years of his life, was well-stocked with the early Church Fathers and with little else—no index certainly to his favorite English authors. But a letter to Thomas

\* The last line of the pencilled note is so badly rubbed that it cannot be read. (Ed.)

Arnold, which reflects to some extent his favorite English classics, has escaped publication to this time.<sup>1</sup>

Thomas Arnold, to whom this letter was addressed, son of the Head Master of Rugby and brother of Matthew, had known Newman at Oxford, had listened, in company with his brother, to the stream of calm eloquence that rolled from the lips of Newman preaching at St. Mary's and had fallen under his spell. So it was natural that he should turn to Newman for direction when in 1856 he became a Catholic. Arnold had to leave a position in New Zealand as a result of this change in religion, and sailed for England with his family, writing to Newman, in the meantime, about the future. Inasmuch as Arnold had published some critical work and was planning his "Survey of English Literature," Newman directly offered him a professorship of English literature in the Catholic University at Dublin, which at that time he was forming. The welcome offer was accepted, and Arnold started to plan a survey course for his classes. In regard to a syllabus which Arnold had submitted to him, Newman wrote:

The Oratory, Hagley Road  
Birmingham  
Decr 24, 1856

My dear Arnold

I hope you won't follow what I say because I say it. This means, don't take Addison without conviction. My reasons are such as the following.

1. Periodical literature, and conversational essays are one great portion of English literature down to this day—and he is its patriarch in England. He has founded a *school*, as much as any English author, but Pope.

2. He has had as much to do in forming our language, as Pope (?) I think so. And he has humanized the public, or created a literary taste more than *anyone else*.

3. His *style* has very great beauties. e. g. *Vision of Mirza*. Perhaps Thackeray's "Esmond" is not a fair specimen of it—but *that* is to my mind *most* beautiful.

4. He is a chief classic, for he is so considered *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.

5. I have been very much struck with the way Thackeray takes him up in his History of English Wits. He is a sort of witness of a day so different from Addison's own—unless you think it a theory of Thackeray's.

6. I can't help recollecting, what till Th's book, I had forgotten, that

---

<sup>1</sup> This letter was presented to the Pierpont Morgan Library by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Arnold's daughter. It is published by the kind permission of The Oratory and of the Morgan Library.

## CARDINAL NEWMAN'S LITERARY PREFERENCES 25

he was an author, on whom I doted at 15. I only say this, to show his power still of affecting untaught minds.

I like your introduction of Chaucer, Spencer & the Ballads.

I am not satisfied at the omission of Milton. Yet he is of no School. I am puzzled here.

As to Clarendon, he too represents no school—and what is worse, Charles the 1st is unpopular in Ireland on account of Strafford. Your idea of shortening and mapping is good—but if you go into an *English subject matter*, in opposition to *literature*, the Irish will think it hard that the English rebellion or civil war has the precedence of the raid of Fergus Mac Diormad into Munster in revenge for the dun cow which was stolen from the pastures of his great uncle Thrady in the second century before the Christian era.

I have some compunction in leaving out the novelists, yet who can get boys seriously to read them? Perhaps two or three lectures on them without a text book would be best.

And I have a great difficulty about Gibbon. No one has had a greater effect on the historical style, even when his followers cannot be called Gibbonian. I trace his influence on nearly every writer.

And now a further difficulty as the subject opens is to adapt it to a two year course. Must not you confine the two years to three to six chief classics? If so, they must be Shakespeare, (Milton?) Pope, Clarendon (?) Addison, Johnson. Or who?—Then for the next two years you might take Spenser—Bacon—Milton—the Novelists, . . .

I don't think you need mind chronology in your course, for your main point is to put the students on a level with others in knowledge. E. g. to start at Woolwich it would be respectable to be acquainted with Shakespeare, Pope, Addison, & Johnson, and to *know about* (i. e. by means of professorial lectures) Spenser, Bacon Dryden, Milton, Fielding . . .

This is what strikes me at the moment—take it quantum valeat.

Yours most sincerely,

John H. Newman  
of the Oratory

T. Arnold Esq.

The best wishes of the season to you and yours.

This letter is the more important in that it shows, in an orderly, explicit fashion, Newman's range and taste among the English classics in a plan that is neither to be found or suggested in any of his works or other letters. However, in the lectures that Newman delivered as a prelude to his induction as Rector of the Catholic University in 1852, he mentioned some of his favorites to exemplify points that he was making. In the lecture on "Literature," for instance, Newman stated what he meant by a classic: "By the Classics of a national Literature I mean those authors who have

the foremost place in exemplifying the powers and conducting the development of its language."<sup>2</sup> Several times in these lectures he adverts to Addison, the writer for whom he made such a strong plea to Arnold:

. . . If there be any of our classical authors, who might at first sight have been pronounced a University man, with the exception of Johnson, Addison is he; yet even Addison, . . . must be something more, in order to take his place among the Classics of the language, and owed the variety of his matter to his experience of life, and to the call made on his resources by the exigencies of his day. . . .<sup>3</sup>

But Addison was a master-stylist, and Newman attributed this quality not so much to his training as to an inborn faculty:

. . . "Poeta nascitur, non fit," says the proverb; and this is in numerous instances true of his poems, as well as of himself. They are born, not framed; they are a strain rather than a composition; and their perfection is the monument, not so much of his skill as of his power. And this is true of prose as well as of verse in its degree: who will not recognize in the vision of Mirza a delicacy and beauty of style which is very difficult to describe, but which is felt to be in exact correspondence to the ideas of which it is the expression?<sup>4</sup>

Might not Newman have written these words of himself as well? Not that he was a careless composer: his "only master of style" was Cicero, to whom, as he wrote the Reverend John Hayes, "I think I owe a great deal . . . and as far as I know to no one else."<sup>5</sup> His letters show the marks of careful attention. At the Oratory in Birmingham thousands of rough drafts of his letters are preserved as he saved them. But the evidence all seems to point to the conclusion that Newman was a prose stylist born, not made by imitation of English models.

Even this letter presents no complete chart to Newman's favorites in English literature. It must be remembered that he was helping to plan a course for college use, and certain compromises have to be made with personal preferences. It is not known whether Arnold used this revision of Newman's, or even if he included Addison for whom Newman had made such a strong case. He did hold

<sup>2</sup> *The Idea of a University*. London (1910), 321.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 312.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 279.

<sup>5</sup> April 13, 1869. *Letters*, London (1891), II, 477.

the chair of English Literature at the University until 1862, when he joined Newman at the Oratory School in Birmingham.

Newman left the Catholic University some time before Arnold, after a trying and unsuccessful attempt as administrator. It is only in the lectures that he delivered before the inauguration outlining his ideals of education, and in this particular letter that he has shown his tastes in literature.

J. CONNOP THIRLWALL

*Long Island University*

---

### FIRST DRAFTS OF LANIER'S VERSE

In the Lanier Alcove of the Johns Hopkins Library there are two documents which permit us to learn something of Sidney Lanier's method of poetic composition and of his revision of his own verse. One of these is his copy of the Bohn Library translation of the *Discourses of Epictetus* by George Long and the other the corrected proof of his "Ode to The Johns Hopkins University." On blank spaces at the beginning and the end of the *Epictetus* Lanier has made penciled notes of great interest to students of his verse.

On a partly blank advertising page are scribbled memoranda reading

Hymns of the Marshes  
Hymns of the Fields  
Hymns of the Mountains

This is probably the very first record of the poet's determination to write three series of nature poems, of which only one group was actually written. Above this is the single word *Swashbuckler*, which apparently he did not use, and below it the phrase *The Shambling Sea*, which grew into a poem. The four hymns of the marshes were arranged by Mrs. Lanier in her edition of the poems in the reverse of the order of composition. In chronological order they are

The Marshes of Glynn  
Individuality  
Marsh Song—At Sunset  
Sunrise

The rough notes in the *Epictetus* grew into the second and third of these poems. These notes—with the stanzas as they appear in the published poems reprinted in the right-hand column—are as follows:

Come on  
Sail on, sail on, fair Cousin Cloud  
Come on  
Come brood upon the marsh with me  
Still—  
Grey—  
Dream-eyed and shadow browed  
Mist—  
Film—

Above the humped and fishy sea  
Over  
Slow think thyself along  
Above the growling Caliban sea  
White Ariel, dream thyself along.  
Above the  
Quite  
And unafraid above the fearsome  
sea

And heartseas'd still for straining  
mast  
Heartseas'd all for yon straining  
mast  
Heartseas'd for all yon straining  
sail  
And laboring smoke that not for  
thee  
Bear ventures o'er the Treacherous  
vast  
Of risk and tease and bottomry  
Bear ventures while thy soul is pale  
With teasing risk and bottomry

Pass kinsman cloud now fair and  
mild  
Go work the will that's not thine  
own  
Fulfill the will that's not thine own  
I work in freedom wild  
But work as plays a little child

*"Individuality," I*

Sail on, sail on, fair cousin Cloud:  
Oh loiter hither from the sea.  
Still-eyed and shadow-brow'd  
Steal off from yon far-drifting  
crowd,  
And come and brood upon the marsh  
with me.

*Stanza I of Marsh Song—At Sunset*  
Over the monstrous shambling sea,  
Over the Caliban sea,  
Bright Ariel Cloud, thou lingerest  
Oh wait, Oh wait, in the warm red  
West,—  
Thy Prospero I'll be.

*"Individuality," II*

Yon laboring low horizon-smoke,  
Yon stringent sail, toil not for thee  
Nor me; did Heaven's stroke  
The whole deep with drown'd com-  
merce choke  
No pitiless tease of risk or bot-  
tomry.

*"Individuality," XVII*

Pass kinsman Cloud, now fair and  
mild:  
Discharge the will that's not thine  
own.  
I work in freedom wild,  
But work, as plays a little child,

Sure of my Father and myself alone  
Sure of my Lord, my self, our Love.  
alone

The Lord of Self and  
me of Love alone

The maker's greater than his  
The maker's  
The Lord—too much to covet one  
The Lord of all's too rich to covet  
one

Or why not plunge thy blades about  
Yon  
Some maggot politician throng  
Swarming to parcel out  
The body of a land, and rout  
The maw-conventicle and ungorge  
Wrong.

What the cloud doeth  
The Lord knoweth  
The cloud knoweth not  
What the artist doeth  
The Lord knoweth  
Knoweth the artist not?

The maker's Lord's over  
                  too great  
                  and strong  
To covet goods of one that He him-  
self  
Hath made his neighbor.  
For if O Lord, they rob me of my  
songs  
What can I give thee? Piteous pivot  
farce  
To think thee giving to Thyself  
through me.

Sure of the Father, Self, and Love  
alone.

*"Individuality," XIII*

My Lord is large, my Lord is  
strong:  
Giving, He gave: my me is mine.  
How poor, how strange, how wrong,  
To dream He wrote the little song  
I made to him with love's unforced  
design.

*"Individuality," X*

Or why not plunge thy blades about  
Some maggot politician throng  
Swarming to parcel out  
The body of a land, and rout  
The maw-conventicle, and ungorge-  
Wrong?

[Printed without change as an  
interlude in "Individuality."]

*"Individuality," XIII*

My Lord is large, my Lord is  
strong:  
Giving, He gave: my me is mine.  
How poor, how strange, how wrong,  
To dream He wrote the little song  
I made to him with love's unforced  
design.

Also in the *Epictetus* are the lines which apparently grew into  
verses not included in Lanier's *Poems*, though later printed among  
his *Poem Outlines*.

Credo, thou'rt a domestic dog  
 Stay at home and tend the women  
     and children  
 Come Fido, Here, we'll fare into the  
     fields  
 Here Fido, dog, we'll fare into the  
     fields.

I had a dog  
 And his name was not *Fido* but  
*Credo*.  
 (In America they shorten his name  
     to "Creed.")  
 My child fell into the water:  
 Then in plunged Credo and brought  
     me out my child  
         My beloved One  
         Brought him out truly,  
         But lo, in my child's throat and in  
             his limbs  
         In the throat and the limbs of the  
             child of man,  
         Credo's teeth had bitten deep  
         (A good dog but a stern one was  
             Credo)  
         And my child though sound  
         Was scarred in his beautiful face  
         And was maimed in his manful  
             limbs  
         For life, alas, for life.  
         Thus Credo saved and scarred and  
             maimed  
         The Son of Man, my Child.

On February 22, 1880 Lanier read at the Commemoration Day exercises of the University an original poem entitled "Ode to The Johns Hopkins University." Of this occasional poem the manuscript and a first and second proof have been preserved in the University Library. A few of his revisions are reproduced below.

In four brief cycles round the punctual sun	In four brief cycles round the punc- tual sun
Has she, old learnings latest daugh- ter, won	Has she, old learning's latest daugh- ter, won
Such grace, such stature, and such faithful fame	This grace, this stature, and this fruitful fame.
Thus sped with gifts of Love and toil and thought	Thus sped helps gifts of love and toil and thought
And hope and faith by guardian spirits brought	Thus forwarded of faith, with hope thus fraught.
Complete as Pallas to begin her way	Complete as Pallas she began her way
And here O later Pallas long remain	And here O finer Pallas long remain

Through larger cycles round a richer sun  
O blest Minerva of these milder days  
The freedom of the city grant  
Let every player that doth mimic us  
Bring large Lucretius with restored mind  
Bring faith that sees with sure and level eyes  
And many peoples call from shore to shore  
See how this Pallas blest has Baltimore

Through nobler cycles round a richer sun  
O blest Minerva of these larger days  
Till thou the freedom of the city grant  
Let every player that shall mimic us  
Bring large Lucretius with unmaniae mind  
Bring faith that sees with undisingling eyes  
And many peoples call from shore to shore  
The world has bloomed again at Baltimore.

What intermediate versions there may have been between the pencilings in the *Epictetus* and the finished poems it is impossible to say. The Johns Hopkins *Ode* was pretty certainly something of an impromptu, and in the manuscript and the two proofs we probably have the whole story. The record is at least sufficient to give a hint as to Lanier's method of composition and to show that he revised assiduously, making changes that notably improved both the meaning and the melody of his verse.

JOHN C. FRENCH

*The Johns Hopkins University*

### THE NECK OF CHAUCER'S FRIAR

In Chaucer's description of the Friar occurs the following line:

His nekke whyt was as the flour-de-lys; . . .<sup>1</sup>

I have been unable to find an explanation or interpretation of it. As Chaucer was not accustomed to saying things without a purpose, we may be sure that this line whose meaning is apparently unintelligible has a significance, if we but knew the key. This key, it seems to me, may be found by following the theory that Chaucer employed rather freely the science of physiognomy in his delineation of character.<sup>2</sup> From a study of this in relation to the Friar

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Skeat, *The Oxford Chaucer*, C. T., A. I. 238.

<sup>2</sup> See W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences*, New York, 1927,

we may glean, if not a complete solution, at least a suggestion of such. John Metham, a late exponent of the science, has this to say about necks.

A nek the qwyche ys rowgh off schap sygnyfyith an ontawgh(t) parsonne,  
and a wyllde, chargyng off ryght nowght. . . . Sum-tyme yt happyth that  
scolerys the qwyche stody in vnyuersyteys at her frendys fyndyng, qwan  
thei perseyeue that of ese her nekkys be pleyn and ful off qwyete and off  
rest, and that this tokyn ys opyn and vcyus, be craft thei make her nekkys  
stabyl and rugh, that ys to sey, ful off schrynkys; but her craft holdyth  
noght, for-a(s)-myche as thei hyde in that parte, the werkyng of nature  
schewythy on odyr partys.<sup>3</sup>

This is but faintly suggestive. Chaucer plainly says that the Friar's neck is white and indicates no less plainly that the Friar is a wandering vagabond and no university scholar. Nevertheless the inference is that a smooth, soft neck was a disgraceful possession, else these scholars would not have gone to the pains of somehow disguising or roughening theirs. From two other sources of earlier date than Metham, and in whose tradition he writes, we have more definite reference to color.

. . . Man which is / feble of Colour  
ffor thyn avayl / looke that thou flee,  
ffor he is pleynly / tak heed vnto me,  
To lecherye dispoosed / be nature and kynde,  
And othir evelys / many as I ffynde.<sup>4</sup>

*Signa luxuriosi: qui est albi coloris et pilosus, rectis capillis et grossis et nigris, et tempora pilosa, oculus pinguis et insanus.*<sup>5</sup>

While we cannot absolutely unite these authorities into one argument, we can at least hazard a guess that some odium attached to a "pleyn" neck and a "feble" color. Porta, a physiognomist after Poleman, Admantius, Aristotle, and other ancient masters of the science, states more definitely what Metham and Lydgate and Burgh only hint at.

or *Three Prose Versions of the Secreta Secretorum*, ed. Robt. Steele, EETS. E. S. No. 74, 1898, or T. B. Clark, "Forehead of Chaucer's Prioress," *PQ*, ix (July, 1930).

<sup>3</sup> *The Works of John Metham*, ed. Hardin Craig, EETS. No. 132, 1916, pp. 135-136.

<sup>4</sup> Lydgate and Burgh, *Secrees of Old Philisoffres*, ed. Robt. Steele, EETS. E. S. No. 66, 1894, ll. 2530-2534.

<sup>5</sup> Bartholomaei de Messana (*Aristotelus*) *Phusiognomonika* in R. Foerster's *Scriptores Physiognomonici*, I, Lipsiae (Teubner), 1893, p. 39.

## Collum valde fractum.

Vtriusque textus mancus est, Polemonis & Adamantij,<sup>6</sup> & obscurus; conabimur tamen pro virili restituere. Qui vero artificio quodam valde effractum collum habere se simulant, eo ipso se cinaedos ostendunt, dum enim hoc modo se emendare cupiunt, nihil aliud quaerunt, quam ut impudicitiam & impudentiam suam abscondant. Idem in figura effeminati ei collum fractum adscribunt, & est contrarium praedicti signi, nam si durum collum, & firmum, pertinaces & duros ostendit; fractum molliusculos & effeminatos demonstrare par est. Albertus hic satis importune cum ceruice multa cinaedi signa adducit, inquiens: Cum videris ceruicis fluxum, & labiorum quandam contractionem risui quodammodo similem, & inordinatam oculorum conuersionem, inconstantiam in sedendo & stando, & vocem tremulam, constanter affirma talem esse effeminatum. Fabius: Caput, vel ceruix humilis, humilitatem demonstrat. Plutarchus narrat, quod Alcibiades quodammodo ceruicem frangebat.<sup>7</sup>

## Mutilum collum.

Quibus collum mutilum, audace verbis, re timidos ostendit, Adamantius. Albertus: Breue collum, cum temeritate audacem notat.<sup>8</sup>

"Cinaedos" then, a soft neck, is an indication of perversion, and university scholars and other celibates either altered their necks or tried to excuse themselves on the ground of their cloistered habits. While the two adjectives "white" and "soft" do not occur in apposition either in the physiognomists or in Chaucer it seems reasonable that they do imply the same cervical condition.

If we are to suppose then that the Friar is one of these "cinaedi," we have several other characteristics of depravity mentioned by Porta which we can compare with Chaucer's description of the Friar to further substantiate this theory. Metham says that "the werkynge of nature schewyth on odyr partys," and Porta goes further to describe these other manifestations of nature above as contraction of the mouth somewhat like a smile, inordinate rolling of the eyes, shiftiness in sitting and standing, and a trembling voice.

<sup>6</sup> For verification of this compare Polemonis *Physiognomon*, in *Scriptores physiognomiae veteres*, ed. I. G. F. Franzius, 1780 or Polemonis *de Phisiognomania Liber Arabice et Latine*, ed. Georgius Hoffmann in R. Foerster's *op. cit.*, p. 218, or Admantii Sophistae *Physiognomicon*, trans. Franzius, *loc. cit.*, or Admantii *Physiognomonica*, ed. Foerster, *loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup> Johannis Baptiste Portae *De Humana Physiognomonica*, Rothomagi, 1650, lib. II, p. 207.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 205.

None of these items fits exactly the Friar, but their combined import is parallel to Chaucer's description:

Somewhat he lipsed, for his wantownesse,  
To make his English swete up-on his tonge.  
His eyen twinkled in his heed aright,  
As doon the sterres in the frosty night.  
And rage he coude, as it were right a whelpe.

For twinkling eyes Metham has a bad word.

Eyn the qwyche twynkyl and in maner lawgh with the chere, yff the  
eye off the self be drye, thei sygnyffye gret malyce.\*

The aggregate of these arguments seems to point to a character of licentiousness and depravity of some sort in the Friar. Chaucer says that he was familiar with worthy women of the town, with the taverns, the tapsters, the sellers of victual, and that he was a smooth talker. As his neck is white, he is probably one of these "cinaedi" who is so bold and shameless in his infamy that he does not trouble himself with a disguise.

OZE E. HORTON

*Nashville, Tenn.*

---

#### CHAUCER'S PRIORESS AGAIN: AN INTERPRETIVE NOTE

The charming prioress who graces Chaucer's prologue, touching the hearts of the most worldly and hardened pilgrims with her pathetic tale and holding her own in this motley company because her heart, like Sir Galahad's, is pure, has long been, despite her demureness, a very conspicuous lady. Ever since she sprang in her modish costume from her creator's fertile brain she has aroused controversy; many scholars and commentators have jostled in her behalf, but fortunately in this contest only opinions have been unseated and nothing but ink spilled. And yet a gulf yawns between some of these opinions, for certain older critics by an exegesis of the text that would probably have astonished Chaucer inferred that she was a disreputable woman; on the other hand, Sister Madeleva in an interesting essay so spiritualized the nun

\* Metham, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

that she lost all contact with humanity and was prematurely canonized. Both views are, I believe, extreme, and the truth lies in the golden mean.

Professor Lowes, in his acute interpretation of this character in his article entitled "The Prioress's Oath," has shed more light on this matter than any one else; however, he states: "I have no attention of pushing to its limits the curious analogy between the Prioress herself and the special saint whose name, to her mind, carried greatest weight."<sup>1</sup> But since tyros rush in where experts hesitate to tread, I shall attempt to do what Professor Lowes left undone.

Mr. Lowes asserts that St. Eligius (St. Loy) was the prioress's favorite saint because "he was at once, in a word, an artist and a courtier and a saint, a man of great physical beauty and a lover, in his earlier days, of personal adornment."<sup>2</sup> In another assertion in the same article, moreover, the author has seized upon the crux of the problem: "The brooch on the rosary sums up in a master-stroke the subtle analysis of the Prioress's character—the delicately suggested clash between her worldly and her religious aspirations."<sup>3</sup>

In her aforementioned essay Sister Madeleva has attacked this interpretation with some asperity in these words: "The suggestion that even Chaucer had in mind an ambiguous meaning for the motto 'Amor vincit omnia' or any eye to its cheaper journalistic value seems to me unworthy and inconsistent with his attitude of pronounced respect towards the Prioress."<sup>4</sup> Undoubtedly Chaucer meant no disrespect, but why does the Sister use such singular epithets? I fail to see in what way the characterization is cheap except on the hypothesis that human nature or the life-force is cheap, which would be a rather pessimistic and cynical tenet. And as to the journalistic quality of Professor Lowes' portrait, is this phrase necessarily so damning? The difficulty is that the yellow journals have so boisterously advertised themselves that they have shouted down their more dignified and substantial brethren with

<sup>1</sup> "The Prioress's Oath," by Professor John L. Lowes, in the *Romanic Review*, Vol. v, p. 375.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 369.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 375.

<sup>4</sup> *Chaucer's Nuns and Other Essays*, by Sister Mary Madeleva, p. 18.

the result that "journalistic" has become synonymous with "meretricious." But Chaucer, like Addison, Steele, De Quincey, and Hazlitt centuries later, was in a sense a journalist, for he closely observed and vividly reported the doings and sayings of the travellers in his famous cavalcade. A little thought clears Mr. Lowes of a questionable idea.

It is Sister Madeleva's opinion that "Nothing but a very urgent spiritual quest could have induced them [the nuns] to leave their cloister and join so worldly and public an excursion."<sup>5</sup> Nothing? It is at least equally probable that the nun was obeying a natural impulse to catch once more a glimpse of the world that she had renounced. It is clear that she was not averse to violating rules, for she owned "smale houndes." The obvious motive of this unconventional behavior was her desire to emulate the ladies of the court. If she could yield to the almost universal feminine impulse to be fashionable, she might easily have succumbed to another worldly allurement, though she doubtless persuaded herself that she was solely actuated by a thirst for spiritual perfection on this immortal pilgrimage.

I wish not to be misunderstood. I am not for a moment hinting that the prioress had a tarnished character. Though this interpretation has been advanced, I consider it untenable, as I have stated above, for nothing in the prologue, the links, or the prioress's tale would warrant such an opinion. I do feel, however, that her motives, like those of the rest of us, were mixed and that she succeeded in hiding the less lofty ones from herself. But Chaucer, who like all great creative artists had a penetrating insight into unconscious motives, dexterously suggested the very human yearnings hidden in the heart of Madame Eglentyne.

I believe, then, that Professor Lowes's statement of the "curious analogy" between the prioress and St. Loy is not exactly the point. My interpretation is that unwittingly the nun admired the superb physique and handsome face of this versatile and attractive saint. (Professor Lowes quotes in his article a passage from St. Ouen, the friend and biographer of St. Loy, clearly revealing his fellow-worker's intellectual and physical appeal.) To put it succinctly, I believe that unconsciously she had a very human affection for the artist-saint. What could be more normal than that a woman bound

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

to celibacy by the rules of her order should derive in the recesses of her mind much satisfaction from wearing a brooch adorned with the inscription "Amor vincit omnia?" If queried in this matter, she would undoubtedly have sincerely insisted that celestial love was alluded to, but it is quite natural that a woman who had long dwelt in the odor of sanctity should have desired another sort of fragrance.

To clinch my argument, I wish to cite and comment on the following footnote in Professor Lowes's article to which I have so frequently referred: "St. Loy is still invoked among the 'petites ouvrières de Paris' when they wish to see in a dream the young man whom they are to marry."<sup>6</sup> This is a significant fact. The fascinating saint appealed to them as he did to the prioress, and they certainly would not have been averse to the appearance in their dreams of a young man embodying the personal attractions of their patron.

It is evident that this conception by no means belittles the prioress but, on the contrary, by humanizing her it makes her dedication to the religious life more significant and perhaps more heroic.

BENJAMIN B. WAINWRIGHT

*University of Vermont*

---

### THE CHAUCERIAN-AMERICAN "I GUESS"

Of *I gesse*, as used by Chaucer, the writers of *The King's English*<sup>1</sup> assert that "the sense he sometimes gives it is very finely distinguished from the regular Yankee use." The expression is accordingly to be condemned for modern British use as an American innovation, not a genuine Chaucerian survival: "If we use the phrase—parenthetically, that is, like Chaucer and the Yankees—we have it not from Chaucer, but from the Yankees, and with their, not his, exact shade of meaning." This is very explicit—if not particularly urbane—and it represents an impression shared by other Englishmen than the brothers Fowler. I shall not discuss the standard of judgment that leads these critics to condemn any word that is in American but not in British use, no matter what the intrinsic value of the word, and no matter what its former

<sup>6</sup> Lowes, *op. cit.*, footnote 51, p. 384.

<sup>1</sup> 3rd edition (1930), p. 33.

status; they outlaw *fall*, for example, which they fully admit to be "better on the merits than *autumn*, in every way," but the use of which they must nevertheless forego because it is now purely Yankee. Apart from this, is there any reason to feel that what they assert about *I guess* is correct? Are the Chaucerian and the "Yankee" uses, in fact, either "very finely" or in any way differentiated?

That *I gesse* is a favorite Chaucerian expression, as the Fowlers indicate, is of course very well known. *Gesse* occurs, according to the Chaucer *Concordance*, no less than seventy-seven times, while *gessed* occurs only once, and *gessynge* but four times. Of the occurrences of *gesse* (to omit any dubious cases), fifty-six are immediately preceded by the first personal pronoun and are clearly parenthetical. There is no doubt, then, that the *I gesse* is a frequent qualifying phrase of Chaucer's, and that the use of *gesse* in this locution is by all odds the commonest employment of the word in his works. One may fairly inquire, therefore, whether the sense that he gives it is different from that of the corresponding Americanism.

That the parenthetical phrase frequently is *as I gesse* rather than simply *I gesse* does not, I think, alter the question. The idiom, in other words, may sometimes be slightly different from the modern one—as it is also in phrases like "so as it semed me" and "as it thinketh me"—but the meaning of the phrase may still be identical. What, then, does *I gesse* or *as I gesse* mean in Chaucer?

Professor Manly does not think it necessary to include *gesse* in the glossary of his edition of the *Canterbury Tales*. The omission may presumably be taken as silent evidence of his belief that the Chaucerian use and that familiar to American readers are one and the same. Skeat's glossary was primarily prepared, it may be presumed, for the British reader; here the meanings given for *gesse* are 'suppose, imagine.' These, surely, are also the correct equivalents of the phrase as used today in American conversation and occasionally in American writing, sometimes even that of a formal or literary character.<sup>2</sup>

Examination of the Chaucerian lines in which *I gesse* or *as I gesse* is used in a parenthetical construction bears out the conclusion that the American use is *not* subtly or otherwise differentiated

<sup>2</sup> H. B. Hinckley, it may be noted, has pointed out that the maligned "Yankeeism" has, in point of fact, been used, though rarely, in standard

from the Chaucerian. Here are the first four instances of its use in the *Canterbury Tales*:

Of twenty yeer of age he was, I gesse, (*Prol.*, 82)  
 A forster was he soothly, as I gesse, (*Prol.*, 117)  
 Bihynde hir bak, a yerde long, I gesse. (*Kts. Tale*, 1050)  
 But Venus is it soothly, as I gesse. (*Kts. Tale*, 1102)

As further testimony the first two occurrences of the phrase in *Troilus and Criseyde* may be appended:

Ye saw the lettre that she wrot, I gesse? (I, 656)  
 If she be fair, thou wost thyself, I gesse! (I, 882)

Will any American maintain that the sense of the phrase in any one of these six lines is at all different from that which he hears habitually given to *I guess* in everyday conversation? These lines, it may be added, would seem to be thoroughly representative of the general Chaucerian use.

The British belief that the Chaucerian and the American meanings of *I guess* are to be differentiated is therefore quite groundless. At the same time, an American is conscious that he does not, in any formal sort of speaking or writing, make the same free use of the phrase that Chaucer does. While the *meaning* of the phrase is the same, one must confess that it has nevertheless come very generally to be regarded as a colloquialism (if not a vulgarism) that should be eliminated, except perhaps from familiar conversation. It is a pity that it should be so. Chaucer did not hesitate to admit colloquialisms into his poetry; they are an important element, indeed, in giving his writing that racy, insouciant air

British poetry of much later date than Chaucer. The passages he cites (*Notes on Chaucer*, 8; and "Chauceriana," *MP.*, XIV, 317) are these:

And to our wish I see one hither speeding,  
 An Ebrew, as I guess, and of our tribe.  
 (Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, 1539-40)

. . . he, as I guess  
 Had gazed on Nature's naked loveliness,  
 (Shelley, *Adonais*, 274-5)

And another, a lord of all things, praying  
 To his own great self, as I guess;  
 (Tennyson, *Maud*, Part II, 5, 3)

It is interesting that in all three instances the idiom is *as I guess* rather than *I guess*.

that is one of its principal charms. One may perhaps voice the hope that the American will, in spite of the not too subtle British scorn, continue to preserve the Chaucerian phrase and that the phrase will not be restricted to colloquial use. In point of fact, it is not always so restricted. Miss Millay is to be applauded for her use of *I guess* in a distinctly elevated setting:

Their difference now above the board, I guess,  
Discharges what beneath the board is due.

*(Fatal Interview, Sonnet xxiii)*

*Temple University*

STUART ROBERTSON

#### WHITMAN INTERVIEWS BARNUM

On April 28, 1846, the steamer Great Western arrived off Sandy Hook after a passage of seventeen days and six hours. Chief among its passengers was P. T. Barnum who with Tom Thumb had invaded and conquered Europe and now was anxious to attract greater attention in America. To further such a purpose this great showman had brought with him "Mlle. Jane, the only living Orang Outang in either England or America,"<sup>1</sup> another drawing card for the American Museum.

It may be surmised that few were more interested in the European experiences of Barnum than the young editor of *The Brooklyn Eagle*. It was not, however, until May 23, 1846, that these two met. Whitman notes what Barnum said in this uncollected item:

BARNUM ON EUROPE.—We saw Mr. Barnum, of [sic] Tom Thumb notoriety, manager of the Museum, &c., in New York, day before yesterday. He told us about his tour through all the capitals of Europe, and his intercourse with the kings, queens, and the big bugs. We asked him if anything he saw there made him love Yankeeedom less. His gray eyes flashed: "My God!" said he, "no! not a bit of it! Why, sir, you can't imagine the difference.—There everything is frozen—kings and *things*—formal, but absolutely *frozen*: here it is *life*. Here it is freedom, and here are *men*." A whole book might be written on that little speech of Barnum's. (*The Brooklyn Eagle*, Monday, May 25, 1846, p. 2, column 3.)

THEODORE A. ZUNDER

*Brooklyn College*

---

<sup>1</sup> *New-York Daily Tribune*, April 29, 1846, p. 4, column 1; p. 3, column 6.

## REVIEWS

---

*Ludwig Tieck and England.* By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for the University of Cincinnati, 1931. Pp. 264. \$2.75.

Professor Zeydel, whose scholarly interest in Tieck has been attested by various articles in *Modern Language Notes* and elsewhere, has produced in *Ludwig Tieck and England* a valuable study of one important aspect of Tieck's life and work. Certain phases of the subject had already received competent consideration, notably in the work of Lüdeke von Möllendorff on Tieck's relations to Shakespeare and the older English drama. The outstanding merit of the present study lies in the effort to cover the theme in its entirety. Abundant use has been made of unpublished material, not only of the relatively familiar *Nachlass* in the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, but of widely scattered correspondence. A considerable amount of new material has been brought to light, and earlier errors have been corrected.

Perhaps the most definitive chapter in the volume is *Tieck in England*. Taking Burgsdorff's diary as published by Cohn for a foundation, with various secondary sources, Professor Zeydel adds, corrects, and pieces together, until we gain a record of Tieck's stay in England almost day by day. Further research might establish some of the missing dates when Tieck saw plays in the London theatres, but the chapter presents probably as nearly a complete account of Tieck's visit as we shall ever get.<sup>1</sup> In the chapter on Tieck's great library, its development and dispersion, Professor Zeydel combines the results of research, his own and others, into a comprehensive record not to be found elsewhere; emphasis is naturally laid on English books and Tieck's comments upon them. The survey of Tieck's acquaintance with English literature is especially thorough; his participation in the Shakespeare translation is given a new and searching analysis, though samples of Tieck's emendations in the Schlegel text would have been welcome. Another chapter treats exhaustively of Tieck's connections with individual Englishmen, Coleridge, Crabb Robinson, and others.

<sup>1</sup> Doubtless for lack of space reasons are not always given for the rejection of Burgsdorff's dates, which in many cases Cohn had already corrected. Zeydel gives May 3 for the departure from Berlin, Burgsdorff May 4. The latter date has the support of a letter from Oelsner to Rahel, dated May 6, 1817: "Vorgestern ist Tieck mit Herrn von Burgsdorff nach England aufgebrochen." (*Briefwechsel zwischen Varnhagen und Oelsner* hrsg. von L. Assing, Stuttgart, 1865, I. 103). Presumably the day of the week (Saturday) determined the date.

Research in English books and periodicals enables the author to present a substantial account of English acquaintance with Tieck's work and English critical opinion from 1813 (the English publication of Mme de Staél's *De l'Allemagne*<sup>2</sup> taken as a starting point) to Tieck's death, with a few subsequent items. The author records no English reference to Tieck before 1813, and assumes that he was hardly known. This is doubtless the case. There is, indeed, mention of Tieck's work, his name misspelled, as early as 1800 in the *Monthly Magazine* (IX. 685, and X. 622); it is a mere word but favorable. The reason why interest in Tieck did not develop is probably owing in part to the reputation for unorthodoxy and immorality that the new German literary movement gained in England; evidence might be found in the violent diatribe in the *Monthly Magazine* for December 1802 (XIV. 646-48). Though some English periodicals of significance are not drawn upon, the general picture is without doubt accurate and the conclusions substantiated. In a separate chapter Professor Zeydel subjects the translations of Tieck's works to a brief but adequate test of their merits, illustrating his criticism by specimen passages. It may be added that C. T. Brooks's translation *Spring*, an original for which Professor Zeydel was unable to find among Tieck's lyrics, is a rendering of two stanzas of Golo's address to Genoveva at the end of the scene *Saal auf dem Schloss*. Further, *Glycine's* song in Coleridge's *Zapolya* is a free adaptation of Tieck's *Herbstlied*, as seems proved by an inspection of Coleridge's unrhymed version.<sup>3</sup> Only a hasty glance is granted to Tieck's possible influence on English writers; it is a theme for a separate monograph, but, in view of earlier discussion of Tieck's relationship to Scott, the possible indebtedness of Scott to Tieck, as noted by Stokoe,<sup>4</sup> could have been of interest in Professor Zeydel's brief list.

The topical arrangement of the material leads to frequent repetitions; indeed, the promise of a translation of *Sternbald* is noted twice in the same chapter (p. 145, 150). According to the preface and repeatedly noted in the text, one aim of the work is to point out "a surprising discrepancy between the conscious objectivity of his (Tieck's) imaginative writings and the subjectivism of his critical work." It lies, unquestionably, in the nature of the present study that the evidence tends to prove the second part of this contrast and to leave the objectivity of Tieck's imaginative writings

<sup>2</sup> In the survey of reviews of *De l'Allemagne* it might have been well to include those of William Taylor of Norwich in the *Monthly Review* (LXXII. 273; LXXIII. 63, 352; LXXIV. 268) where attention is directed to *Der gestiefelte Kater* as "the boldest and most singular comedy of the Germans", and *Sternbald* is classified among the "second rate novels".

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Stokoe, *German Influence in the English Romantic Period*, Cambridge 1926, pp. 123-27.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

largely a matter of assertion. In speaking of Tieck's imaginative work, the author seems to conceive of subjectivity in the narrower sense,—“a reflex of external events in his own life” (p. 92), but it is difficult to see how the subjectivity of the critical writings can be reduced to this limited conception.<sup>5</sup> Two of Tieck's *Novellen* are, indeed, cited as reflecting his visit to Stratford, and the chief basis of *Dichterleben* is, it is stated, “his own intuition as a poet.”

Criticism of details must be limited to a few points. It is implied (p. 2) that Young's *Conjectures* (1759), as well as the *Night Thoughts*, was well known in Germany by 1750. The author (p. 151) says Novalis when he means Wackenroder. “S. W. S.” author of the introduction to the translation, *The Midsummer Night, or, Shakespeare and the Fairies*, may well have been S. W. Singer, who wrote prefaces of this sort and published editions of Shakespeare and other earlier authors (p. 177). Bisset Hawkins's *Germany* is mentioned only in connection with some quotations from it in the preface to Baskerville's *Beauties of German Literature* (1847). Hawkins's book appeared in 1838 and contained a long and, in general, well informed account of Tieck, which might have been considered in chronological order along with the work of Strang. The date (second edition 1839) shows that the “romantic city” was Dresden and not Berlin (Zeydel, p. 175). The article in the *Monthly Review*, to which reference is made (p. 147) was by William Taylor of Norwich.<sup>6</sup> Tieck's readings in Dresden were not “public” in the usual sense of the word (p. 30). *Abendzeitung* not *Dresdener Abendzeitung* is the correct title of the paper (p. 30). Because he was by profession a “waterman,” John Taylor called himself the “Water Poet”; Tieck's story *Der Wassermann* is one of his attacks on Young Germany; the title is derived from the extended discussion of Schiller's ballad *Der Taucher*, and a relationship to Taylor's dull verses seems highly improbable. The possible dependence of Tieck's *Der fünfzehnte November* on Chaucer's *Miller's Tale* deserved to be elaborated beyond the mere statement. A discussion of Tieck's indebtedness in *Vittoria Accorombona* to the French Romanticists (p. 46), for example, to Victor Hugo, whom he criticized severely,—only one of Hugo's major novels was published at the time—would lead beyond the limits of the present review.

HARVEY W. HEWETT-THAYER

*Princeton University*

<sup>5</sup> Reference is made to H. Gumbel, *Ludwig Tiecks dichterischer Weg* in *Romantik-Forschungen*, Halle, 1929, although it would not seem that Gumbel limits Tieck's subjectivity in this way.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. W. Robberds, *Memoirs of William Taylor of Norwich*, London, 1843, II. p. 522.

*Emmanuel Kant in England: 1793-1838.* By RENE WELLEK.  
Princeton: University Press, 1931. Pp. ix + 317.

Bertrand Russell has said that Emmanuel Kant was a philosophical catastrophe. A sympathizer with Russell's opinion and radical temperament could find support in Rene Wellek's excellent study of Kant's introduction into England during the years 1793 to 1838. The effect of the dissemination of the Kantian philosophy was not to break the shackles of conventional piety, but to reinforce the spirit of credulity and compromise. Kant in this early period primarily appealed to what William James has called the "tender-minded" thinker, the man with a bias toward rationalism, idealism, optimism, monism, free-will, and religious orthodoxy.

It is doubtless true that Kant cleared the path for modern positivism and agnosticism, even though his purpose was mainly constructive. But the English Kantians utilized the negations of the *Critique of Pure Reason* not to destroy nor to invent anew, but to reestablish a traditional philosophy of comfort, which was frequently stated in dogmatic and highly sentimental terms. If Kant is right, they reasoned, if science and metaphysics apply only to experience and not to the "noumenal" order, then the land of heart's desire may exist in the vast unknown beyond sensible knowledge. What could be more plausible than to suppose that this invisible realm is known to the "heart" but not to the "head"? Kant has justified "faith"; there is no longer anything to hinder belief. Thus did the Romantics prepare the way for the Victorian compromises.

We find nowhere in this period any vigorous utilization of Kant's greatest contribution to philosophy, the proof that form is a part of all experience, that there can be no consciousness at all except organized and unitary consciousness. Kant's argument meant that psychology and epistemology had necessarily to be radically reconstituted, and that the psychological atomism which had been almost universally accredited for the past century had at last received its death blow. The fact that this rallying call to constructive thought fell on practically deaf ears is a striking indication of the decline of speculative virility in England.

In the case of Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* alone did Kant appreciably influence a work of the artistic imagination. But I believe that Wellek has probably underestimated the influence of the Kantianism of Coleridge upon Wordsworth.<sup>1</sup> Coleridge himself was the most prominent and erudite spokesman for Kant in England and therefore deserves special consideration. The reader does

<sup>1</sup> See my recent monograph, *Presiding Ideas in Wordsworth's Poetry*, especially pages 167-169 and 189-193.

not gather from Wellek's account a favorable impression of Coleridge's philosophical capacities. Quite in opposition to J. H. Muirhead's attempt in his book, *Coleridge as Philosopher*, to rehabilitate his reputation as a thinker, Wellek reveals him as a "prophet of the end and failure of Reason," a sentimental uncreative eclectic. He all too readily capitulated to a "mere philosophy of faith." His greatest service was to disseminate ideas widely, not to invent new ones.

In Rene Wellek's study the historian of culture will discover a significant reading of the intellectual pulse of the Romantic Age.

MELVIN M. RADER

*University of Washington*

---

*German Romanticism.* By OSKAR WALZEL. Authorized Translation from the German by ALMA ELISE LUSSKY. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932. Pp. x + 314. \$3.50.

Walzel's two volumes in Teubner's *Natur und Geisteswelt*, after all still the most comprehensive treatment of German Romanticism, are no easy reading for any one not thoroughly conversant with the language of recent German literary investigation, which is fraught with philosophical and newly coined theoretical terminology. The present translation, therefore, is a most welcome addition to our comparatively small stock of handbooks of German literature in English rendering. As far as I can judge from a rather comprehensive testing of the text itself as well as of the wealth of quotations scattered throughout the book, the task has been exceedingly well done to the very point of interpretative renderings wherever these seemed imperative. Only in a few instances I felt that a less ambiguous expression might have been used:

Page 73: "gallant passions" might have been termed more pithily *gallant amours*; page 106: "its setting" is hardly clear enough for *die falsche Stellung*—"our wrong attitude" or "relation toward it" or "our wrong perspective"; page 107: *unschuldig* referring to the *Dümmling* type is "naïve" rather than "inoffensive"; the passage above, "master of all masters," is hardly adequate to *Hans aller Häuse*, of which, however, a satisfactory translation is very difficult; the translation on page 123 line 3, foll. does not take into account the intended repetition of *zählen und nennen* in *zählt und nennt* four lines below; the end of this quotation *die Tonkunst strömt ihn uns selber vor* is excellently done into "in music, however, the stream itself seems to be released," to give at least one example of the author's achievement.

I very much regret that no attempt at a metrical translation of poetry has been made, which seems to me indispensable in almost all of the quoted passages. If the translator did not dare to try her own hand she might have called on Mr. John Rothensteiner, who published that very commendable book of romantic verse, *The Azure Flower*, two years ago (see *MLN.*, XLVII, 3).

Type setting and proof reading have been given great care, and in spite of frequent italics, insertions of numbers, and the regrettable splitting of the *Umlaut* in all German passages the page presents a much quieter and less irritating impression to the eye than the German original.

The photograph of Oskar Walzel faces the title page. I can not help thinking that some reproductions of the work of romantic painters for comparison with the spirit of this literature were called for.

ERNST FEISE

---

*Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte, ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn.* Unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Fachgenossen nach dem Tode von Johann Willibald Nagl und Jakob Zeitler herausgegeben von EDUARD CASTLE. Dritter (Schluss-) Band, Abteilung 1-8. 1848-1918. Wien: Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Fromme 1926-(1931).

Wer sich nicht durch den Umfang und die etwas altmodische Aufmachung dieses Werkes, das durch die lange Ausdehnung seiner Erscheinungszeit benachteiligt wurde, abschrecken lässt, wird in dieser deutsch-österreichischen Literaturgeschichte eine wahre Fundgrube entdecken, die freilich beim Abschluss durch die Springwurzel eines hoffentlich ergiebigen Registers ihre Schätze erst völlig erschliessen wird. Der dritte, hier vorliegende Band, der mit dem Jahre 1926 seine Veröffentlichung beginnt, ist soweit bis zur achten Abteilung gediehen und soll mit dem Jahre 1918 abschließen. Er beginnt mit einer Einführung in die politischen Probleme zwischen 1848 bis 1866 und einer Darlegung der geistigen Signatur der Zeit in Philosophie und Philologie, um über Theater zu Drama und Kritik (Kürnberger) fortzuschreiten. Hamerling erfährt eine ausführliche Darstellung (p. 163-195). Ihm folgen Lyriker und Aphoristiker, die katholische Literaturbewegung und der Zeitroman, dem sich Alpenländische Heimatserzählung und Volkstheater anschliessen. Im weiteren Verlauf werden die Presse und besonders die Literatur der Kronländer behandelt.

Die siebente Abteilung endlich geht ausführlich auf das epische Werk Anzengrubers, Roseggers, Marie von Ebner-Eschenbachs und Ferdinand von Saars ein, denen Jackob Julius David folgt, während in der achten wiederum die literarische Produktion der Länder im Vordergrund steht.

Die Fülle des Materials, die hier geboten wird und auch bis auf Grössen dritten und vierten Ranges sich erstreckt, könnte natürlich von einem Einzelnen nicht bewältigt werden. Zeitweise verliert sich die Darstellung in einfache Aufzählung von Namen und Werken, was indessen in einem so enzyklopädischen Werke kaum zu vermeiden ist, das sich ja auch im Titel als Handbuch ankündigt. Umso mehr ist die Lesbarkeit der zusammenhängenden Partien anzuerkennen und die Einheitlichkeit des Planes, die wohl dem jetzigen Herausgeber Eduard Castle, der nach dem Tode von Johann Willibald Nagl und Jakob Zeitler für das Gesamtwerk als verantwortlich zeichnet, zu verdanken ist.

Die Schwierigkeit der Bewältigung eines auseinanderstrebenden und in En- und Exklaven zerstreuten Materials muss um so mehr anerkannt werden, als in der gegenwärtigen Zeit die Fortführung und Vollendung des Werkes auf grosse Hindernisse hat stossen müssen. Die letzten Kapitel, in denen Österreichs Literatur von besonderer Bedeutung für das Bild der Entwicklung von Lyrik, Roman und Drama im Rahmen des deutschen Schrifttums gewesen ist, stehen noch aus.

ERNST FEISE

---

*Abraham Cowley, sa vie, son œuvre.* Par JEAN LOISEAU. Paris: Henri Didier, 1931. Pp. xvii + 715.

*Abraham Cowley's Reputation in England.* (By) JEAN LOISEAU. Paris: Henri Didier, 1931. Pp. x + 221.

It may or may not be significant that the same year 1931 should have seen the appearance of two important studies of Cowley, that of Professor A. H. Nethercot and now this of Professor Loiseau. The two scholars had been working independently on the same theme, and it is pleasant to read that when they became aware of the fact they exchanged their nearly completed books for each other's information. Each author can therefore quote the other. For example, Loiseau's discovery of a new and curious edition of Cowley's *Discourse by way of Vision* was first announced by Nethercot.

The two books show characteristic differences though each contains much original research and is a valuable contribution to learning. Professor Nethercot treats Cowley's work along with his

life and moves rapidly, sometimes in rather colloquial English. Professor Loiseau follows a type and is much more deliberate and academic. After giving 194 pages to Cowley's life, he devotes 113 to his thought, 174 to his various *genres*, 113 to his technique and 39 to his originality. Ten pages are given to appendices and 33 to bibliography. The history of Cowley's reputation is reserved to be dealt with separately. The criticism has the delicate balance one expects from a French scholar and the style is beyond reproach. But some repetition is unavoidable, and the work has not quite sufficient sparkle to prevent weariness towards the end.

It is satisfactory to find the two biographers in general agreement in regard to the facts—even the new-found facts—of Cowley's life. I think however that neither quite appreciates the importance to an English boy of a school-connexion, especially a connexion with a great school like Westminster. The most brilliant Westminster boy of the decade before Cowley was Thomas Randolph, who passing from school to Trinity College, Cambridge, had there made his mark as a witty poet and writer of comedies. One of his plays had been acted at Trinity before the King and Queen in 1632, two others *Amyntas* and *The Entertainment* (later published as *The Muses' Looking Glass*) had been given at Court or in a London playhouse. He had been adopted as a "Son of Ben." Cowley had not all Randolph's directness, or *verve*, but we can hardly doubt that as a schoolboy, he had aspired to follow in his footsteps—his school play *Love's Riddle* was in imitation of *Amyntas*—and had grieved in 1635 over his early death. If Cowley preferred Trinity to Christ Church, may not Randolph have been in his mind? And later when Dryden or Cowper dealt with Cowley, was it quite without the thought that he was a schoolfellow?

Again Trinity like Westminster was a royal foundation, and as such it was the recognized resort of the Court when it visited Cambridge, and provided the plays demanded on such occasions. Had Randolph or Cowley been at another college, he would never have had a play produced in the presence of his Sovereign or the Prince of Wales. A Westminster boy then who became a fellow of Trinity must always have had the feeling of aristocracy. This is manifest in Randolph, and it must also have existed in Cowley. In England the distinction between social classes was never so marked as on the continent, and this Loiseau seems to forget when he harps on Cowley's being a *bourgeois* (e. g. p. 310). Cowley would have called himself 'a gentleman.'

Loiseau perhaps exaggerates the religious element in Cowley. He says (p. 203): 'L'enseignement religieux intense qu'il y reçoit [i. e. at Westminster] ne peut qu'accroître sa religiosité naturelle.' [Experience shows that this need not be the case.] 'A Cambridge il travaille avec la perspective d'entrer dans les ordres.' But does

he? or did Randolph or Spenser or Gabriel Harvey? There were other careers than the church, and I know of no evidence that Cowley ever had the church in view. So I do not agree that "La Davidéide a été composée par un étudiant en théologie" (p. 337). Cowley had not Crashaw's burning faith nor Izaak Walton's simple-minded reverence for bishops and deans. His after-friendship with Hobbes seems to show that the religious influences of his youth sat lightly on him though no doubt the Church of England was much more congenial to him, as it has always been to English latitudinarians, than the bondage of Rome or Puritan fanaticism. Its Calvinism of those days may have made him a determinist (p. 224). Is not the desire of his last days, "to examine and review the original principles of the primitive church," the sign of a man not completely at ease in Zion, one who would perhaps sympathize with the deistical attitude of Lord Herbert of Cherbury? I find much good sense in Nethercot pp. 258-260. It is certainly dangerous, especially in England, to take outward conformity as proof of a man's religious state.

At Cambridge in Cowley's time Loiseau thinks Laud's influence was dominant: "La majorité est nettement pour lui" (p. 55). Nethercot (p. 41) says that Trinity was in the midst of an open rebellion against Laudian ritualism. I consider this the truer account. I believe that Laud's adherents, such as Crashaw at Peterhouse, were a small minority in the University.

Was Cowley more ardent as a loyalist than as a churchman? When he wrote his Preface of 1656 he clearly felt that the royal cause was lost and the time had come to accept the new régime, however reluctantly. But for Cromwell's sudden death in 1658, should we have heard of any retraction? I think therefore that more staunch Royalists had good grounds for viewing Cowley with suspicion and disfavor, and Loiseau is not entitled to consider this attitude unjust: "Quoi de surprenant qu'il se soit senti meurtri . . . par tant d'injustice et de malveillance?" To us, however, Cowley's readiness to accept the *chose accomplie* is more excusable than his later abject royalism.

Loiseau's book differs from that of Pierre Legouis on Marvell by his admitting into his text English poetry in English and not turning it all into French prose. Probably all his readers, French and English, will approve the change and only regret that it was not carried further. Who wishes to read French versions of English letters and prefaces? Still less of Cowley's touching lines to William Harvey.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A few errors in smaller points need correction: p. 15. The royal palace of Whitehall seems to be forgotten; p. 18. Buckingham perished in 1628; p. 282. *New Atlantis* is not told as a dream; p. 317. One would think that Cowley would use George Sandys' translation of the *Metamorphoses*

Professor Loiseau's second book is a very interesting account of the ups and downs of Cowley's reputation in England from the beginning to the present day and is based on a large collection of references to him and his works. It is written in almost faultless English.<sup>2</sup> The result seems to be that Cowley's fame now rests chiefly on his prose essays, the poems associated with them, and his poetical tributes to W. Harvey and Crashaw. Loiseau quotes however with sympathy a clever plea for *The Mistress* made in 1926 by a then very youthful critic, John Sparrow.

It is rather surprising to hear that the Victorian spirit against which a reaction set in about 1890 was 'at heart scientific, rational, in a word classical' (p. 195). If this was true of the élite of the age of Dickens, was it true of the mass of the people? I should be inclined to substitute 'Puritan, moral, sentimental,' and to consider the reaction rather as anti-Puritan than anti-classical. But when one gets on to 'classical' and 'romantic,' one may talk for ever.

G. C. MOORE SMITH

*Sheffield, England*

---

*A Newton Among Poets—Shelley's Use of Science in Prometheus Unbound.* By CARL GRABO. University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Pp. xii + 208. \$3.00.

Professor Grabo has done good service in calling attention once again, and more urgently than ever before, to Shelley's interest in the science of his day. No less an authority than Professor Whitehead had already reminded us in glowing terms (*Science and the Modern World*) that this was really "part of the main structure of (the poet's) mind." All his biographers, from Hogg (1833)

(1621-6) rather than A. Golding's (1565-7); p. 370. Lady Devereux should be Lady Penelope Devereux; p. 464. Castelain has shown that Jonson's *Discoveries* are not his original work as seems to be assumed here; p. 505. "Fundamental Laws," a phrase taken from the political controversies of the day and applied humorously. When in 1642 the bishops were unable to attend parliament owing to the dangerous attitude of the populace, they protested against the validity of anything done in their absence. They were then impeached as endeavoring to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom. In *Hudibras* (1, 760) Ralph complains of royalists: 'They fight for no espoused cause, Frail privilege, fundamental laws. P. 85, l. 1, Query, 'Edmundsbury.' P. 150, bottom, 'colly' = 'Coll[eg]ij.' P. 169, note 72, Query, read 'pererrato,' 'Attigit,' 'Portum,' 'Formam,' 'nobiliorve,' 'sedet,' 'Oxonii.' P. 406, l. 14 from bot. 'of' = 'or.' P. 452, mid. 'considere' = 'confidere' (twice). P. 459, l. 9 from bot. '1878,' query '1788.' P. 533, l. 9, 'said,' query, 'saw.' P. 646, l. 17, 1660 = 1660-1.

<sup>2</sup> On p. 7, however, 'discuss upon' should be 'discuss,' on p. 66 'Epicure' should be 'Epicurus,' on p. 111 'accuse with' should be 'accuse of,' and there is ambiguity in the wording on p. 59, 'damning his works as they thought they must be.'

onwards, had had to dwell on his early infatuation with chemistry. Yet the nineteenth century—the age of “positive” science—passed practically indifferent to Shelley’s lasting preoccupation with scientific philosophy. But this aspect of his genius, now that science is again driven to the confines of metaphysics, appears in something like a fresher and fuller light.

Of course many of Shelley’s observations on geological, meteorological or astronomical phenomena have always been clear enough. Any one perusing the notes to *Queen Mab* realizes that a good deal of scientific knowledge of a kind lay at the back of the “imaginings” of that somewhat immature though by no means contemptible piece of Juvenilia. Again no attentive reader really needs the warning of Prof. Grabo (p. 192) that stalactites are meant in the lines of *Prometheus Unbound*, III, iii, 15-17 “From its curved roof the mountain’s frozen tears, etc.”; and few would be as cautious as he is, when he calls (p. 170) “tentative” the identification of the “wide wandering stars” of II, iv, 88 with comets.

Prof. Grabo has much to say that is less obvious. He is, I think, the first critic who has had the patience to examine more than in a cursory way the books of science which Shelley has (or may have) read—the Encyclopedias of the time, Rees’ and Nicholson’s (which surely should have found a place in the index—though it would seem that Prof. Grabo has had access only to a late edition of the former)—the notes to Erasmus Darwin’s poems, a well-known favorite of Shelley at least when he was in his teens—the works of Herschel (quoted in *Queen Mab*) and of Davy (whose Elements of Chemical Philosophy—the fact should have been recalled—was in Shelley’s eagerness ordered before publication on July 29, 1812) and of Newton (mentioned, all too vaguely, in a couple of letters).

A series of chapters, not all of which of course can be said to serve Prof. Grabo’s purpose immediately, summarize the main conclusions of the writers (pp. 30-117). The second half of the book then draws upon this to explain passages in *Prometheus Unbound*—and I cannot but think it a pity that Prof. Grabo should thus have restricted his outlook, and written a study which certainly answers the subtitle rather than the ambitious (indeed decidedly showy) title of his volume.

The task is on the face of it a difficult one: we have, for the period when *Prometheus* was in Shelley’s thoughts, abundant letters and copious lists of books read by him or his wife; I wish Prof. Grabo had discussed the point, but I do not remember that science figures then at all prominently in the poet’s avocations. Every one will agree that Shelley’s scientific philosophy—shall we call it, in the words he used as early as 1811 (to Miss Hitchener, Nov. 24) his theory of universal “organized animation”?—remained prac-

tically what his early thought had made it; but when we come to trace in a book published in 1820 very definite notions, such as the reading of technical works or actual laboratory experimentation alone would seem likely to keep quite alive, we feel that we are treading very delicate ground: Prof. Grabo himself speaks in one place (p. 141) of "unconscious reminiscences"; and though any profound literary analysis has to consider the possibility of these, it seems safe not to lay the stress on this sort of commentary, when more tangible explanations are available.

I am afraid that many of the clues most confidently offered by our guide are anything but convincing. I cannot for a moment accept his interpretation of III. iii. 134-135 (p. 190): the spirit of the earth, which formerly was a maddening fume "luring men to hatred and war," now rises, "inspiring calm and happy thoughts," filling "with a serener light and crimson air Intense yet soft the rocks and woods around"; because of that single epithet "crimson," must we remember Priestley, Davy and Darwin, and imagine that the "nitrous gas"—which, it appears, under certain conditions shows some such color—is referred to? That the "laughing gas" or one of its congeners should thus monopolize all the beneficent effects of the atmosphere of the liberated world strikes the ingenuous reader as laughable indeed.

Nor can I believe that there is any connexion (even "unconscious" p. 127) between the "light like a green star" which Shelley sets on the forehead of the aforesaid spirit, and the "virgin light, star of the earth and diamond of the night" which is Darwin's poetical equivalent for—the glowworm. That something in this frontal equipment of the spirit should be due to Shelley's delight in the green spark he had been able more or less successfully to educe from his electrical machine in the old Eton days, is both ingenious and plausible. But to gloss "the spirit of the earth = electricity" is both unscientific and unpoetical. The context will not bear out a generalization—which after all would be a minimization: "electricity" may, in the description of Panthea (III. iv), take us as far as "the spray of the salt sea" (phosphorescence) as far even as "the chariot of the foggy cloud" (sheet-lightning?); but when it takes to "walking through fields or cities while men sleep," even Prof. Grabo has to suspect it of being an *ignis fatuus*; and when it goes the length of "loving our sister Asia and drinking the liquid light out of her eyes," we are sure we have been led astray.

Shelley—let him be praised for it—had been quick at seizing the ultimate inferences which contemporary science could support; but when he was writing *Prometheus*, he was far above dabbling with green sparks and nitrous gas; he was then feeding not on Davy and Darwin, but on Dante and Milton; even if the "rays of

gloom" and the "mighty darkness" of Demogorgon in II. iv. 3-5 owe something to the discovery of the dark heat rays made by Herschel, they must owe much more to the "no light, but rather darkness visible" of *Paradise Lost*; and it is hard on the poet who had become such a passionate lover of Greek to suggest that when he spoke of the "tyrant-quelling myrtle" (IV. 272) he "confused the traditions of the laurel and the myrtle" (p. 149) and wished to allude to the protection which the former was supposed to give against the thunder.

But even though we cannot accept without demur the exegesis of our commentator, we are grateful to him for opening a line of research which may lead to valuable results. The main thesis of Prof. Grabo is sound: among the various echoes which go to make up the music of Shelley's poetry, we must not forget the notes which had been struck by contemporary science; this little book may not establish that Shelley was "a Newton"—it usefully reminds us that not only Newton, but several of the scientists, great and small, of the Romantic Era had paved the way to that animistic monism which is the most original and profound conception of a poet whom I suppose no one to-day would be so blind as to call ineffectual.

A. KOSZUL

*Université de Strasbourg*

---

*Hartley Coleridge: Poet's Son and Poet.* By HERBERT HARTMAN, Oxford University Press, 1931. Pp. 14 + 205.

Hartley Coleridge is now the only minor romantic poet who can boast of two recent biographers. It is especially fitting that Earl Leslie Griggs' *Hartley Coleridge: His Life and Work* (London, 1929) and Dr. Hartman's work should have been published three years before the Samuel Taylor Coleridge centenary.

With an aptness of phrase and a sense of humor which Hartley himself would have appreciated, Dr. Hartman produces a reliable synthesis of the known facts of Hartley Coleridge's life and of the scholarship thus far devoted to him. For the general reader this book may serve as an introduction to some of the most interesting personalities of the Romantic Movement; to the scholar it contributes a discriminating reëvaluation of Hartley Coleridge's literary work, along with new facts concerning his posthumous reputation.

Dr. Hartman is delightfully facile in recording the anecdotes that really pertain to the suburbs of human personality and he shows considerable ability in presenting the oddities of a personality strangely akin (as Edmund Blunden said) to Matthew

Arnold's Scholar Gipsy. More attention might, however, have been paid to Hartley's struggle against the nemesis of heredity and to the untoward circumstances which thwarted his creative power. Neither the introductory account of Coleridge and his circle (Ch. I to VI) nor the reiteration of stories arising from Hartley's eccentricities is enough to explain in a psychological way the frustration of genius.

In spite of Dr. Hartman's generous acknowledgment of Professor Griggs' courtesy, his prefatory statement is too general to serve as an accurate guide to the reader in appraising the indebtedness of one scholar to another; nor from the variations in the form of Dr. Hartman's footnotes—"MS. letter (Griggs, 86-91)"; "MS. letter, quoted more fully by Griggs, 106-12"; "MS. note cited by Griggs, 30"—is it possible to determine with any degree of accuracy whether he has actually consulted original manuscripts or merely reproduced material previously quoted by Professor Griggs.<sup>1</sup> There are, moreover, at least two instances in which Dr. Hartman quotes material already published by Professor Griggs, and fails to make any acknowledgment whatsoever. (Cf. Hartman 82 and 182 and Griggs 97 and 156). Inasmuch as Dr. Hartman merely acknowledges the Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge's courtesy in reading proof, is one to assume that he had access to the MSS. in the possession of the Coleridge family or that he has used the term "MS. letter" when his text is drawn either from Professor Griggs' biography or from transcripts to which he was given access by Professor Griggs? It is a curious fact that if Dr. Hartman had access to the same MSS. (as he seems to imply) he should have limited himself with surprisingly few exceptions to the presentation of material already exploited in the earlier biography. Practically all of the quotations purporting to be from MS. letters were previously cited by Professor Griggs. This is also true of the citations from MSS. in the British Museum. Whether the ambiguity of Dr. Hartman is advertent or inadvertent, his technique is not at all points that of the scientific investigator. If he intended to write merely a popular biography, perhaps his obvious dependence on the work of a previous scholar would be a matter of little concern to those interested in scientific research; but inasmuch as his biography has all the pretensions to scientific accuracy, it may give rise to misunderstanding and even to injustice.

PAUL MUESCHKE

*University of Michigan*

<sup>1</sup> [In a letter to the *TLS*. of March 31, 1932, Mr. Hartman acknowledges that his quotations are not from the original manuscripts but are all taken from Mr. Griggs' book—EDITORS.]

*The Proverb.* By ARCHER TAYLOR. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931. Pp. xii + 223. \$2.00.

This book, together with Apperson's *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (1929) and Bonser's *Proverb Literature* (1930), marks a healthy revival of interest in English proverbs. Until within a few years English proverbs have been neglected, perhaps, among other reasons, because of a lingering prejudice to this form of popular expression inherited from the polite circles of eighteenth-century England. With the assistance of these three volumes an interest in English proverbs may now be developed comparable to that enjoyed for many years by the proverbs of the more important European countries.

Professor Taylor's study of the proverb is not designed to serve merely the interests of students of the proverbs of a single country. It concerns itself with fundamental problems in the study of the proverb, problems which have been neglected—indeed apparently not realized—by many authors less well equipped than the author of this book. Although the emphasis throughout is upon English proverbs, the ordinary European languages are drawn on, especially the Teutonic languages, for illustrative material. In the first three chapters is found a brief and systematic treatment of "the ways in which proverbs arise, the kinds of proverbs, and the details of proverbial style." The fourth chapter deals with proverbial phrases, Wellerisms and proverbial comparisons. The twenty pages given to a discussion of the Wellerisms of many countries is one of the most illuminating sections of the book, although the length of treatment is out of proportion to the space allotted to other equally important divisions of the general subject.

One of the most valuable features of this work is the formulation and clarification of proverb problems that need to be undertaken. In the chapter on "The Origins of the Proverb" alone, we are reminded that "no one has ever undertaken a study" of how "new proverbs have often been made on old models" (p. 18); that "we are not well informed about the process of making fables into proverbs" (p. 27); that "the very curious and interesting relations of certain proverbs to some simple and primitive forms of verse have never been cleared up satisfactorily" (p. 32); that "no one has attempted to define the extent and nature of Latin borrowing of Greek proverbs" (p. 44); that "a particularly interesting question presents itself in connection with certain medieval Latin proverbs associated with vernacular proverbs" (p. 46); and that "the more exact definition of what constitutes the stock of international medieval proverbs is perhaps the most important and extensive task in the whole field" (p. 51). These and other needed studies formulated in this and other chapters of the book bring home to the reader the pioneer character of this survey of

the essential characteristics of the proverb and of the problems connected with its study.

The reader of this book who is acquainted with some of the attempts to define the proverbs will welcome Professor Taylor's pronouncement that, "The definition of a proverb is too difficult to repay the undertaking . . . Let us be content with recognizing 'that a proverb is a saying current among the folk'" (p. 3). He will also approve the author's statement that "It is not proper to make any distinction in the treatment of 'learned' and 'popular' proverbs . . . Obviously the distinction between 'learned' and 'popular' is meaningless and is concerned with the accidents of history" (p. 4). However, in the otherwise useful distinction drawn between a proverb which "does not vary in any regard," and a proverbial phrase which "shifts according to time and person" (p. 184), allowance does not seem to have been made for the variant forms of proverbs, as pointed out on pages 63 and 64 and elsewhere. These and similar clarifying statements will assist the student of proverbs in working through the confused mass of material with which he has to deal.

Although this work is the result of an intensive study of the subject from many sides, it has an intrinsic interest that will make large parts of it enjoyable reading to many who have only a general acquaintance with the subject. Throughout the book the opinion is expressed and upheld, by the citation of current proverbs as yet unrecorded in our collections, that Tyler in *Primitive Culture* was wrong in his notion that "the age of proverb-making is past." Such current sayings, it is rightly contended, as *Let George do it, put up or shut up, Watch your step, Cut your losses and let your profits run*, and *The only good Indian is a dead Indian* are none the less proverbs, although as yet they are not found in the printed collections. The divisions of the chapter on "The Content of Proverbs" suggests further reasons why this book will appeal to the general reader as well as to the student of proverbs. This chapter is divided into sections on Customs and Superstitions, Historical Proverbs, Legal Proverbs, "Blason Populaire," Weather Proverbs, Medical Proverbs, Conventional Phrases and Proverbial Prophecies.

A general index and a finding-list of the proverbs referred to are wanting. It is to be regretted that the author—or the publisher—has not thought it advisable to give the reader the assistance of at least a finding-list of the many proverbs that are cited, not infrequently in more than one place, in the 223 pages of this book. He has, however, promised "for the scholar's convenience" an index of the English, German and Latin proverbs cited. In it he will give "what seemed to me the most usefull references from works on the comparative study of proverbs." This index, which "will appear in *FF Communications* (Helsinki)," one wishes

might have appeared with the volume. Fortunately selected bibliographical references have been included in footnotes at the beginning of each section of the discussion.

The many foreign proverbs quoted throughout the book from ten or a dozen foreign languages are so consistently translated (as they should be) that one wonders why, on page 73, proverbs in Latin, German and Italian are not translated. On page 37 we are told that, "We are indebted to Francis Bacon for *Knowledge is power*." On page 34, however, we read, "No one disputes Shakespere's claim to *To be or not to be*, but Sir Francis Bacon has not maintained his hold on *Knowledge is power* with equal success."

In the discussion of "Proverbs and Literature" we read (p. 172), "Writings which make a conspicuous effort at literary style generally avoid them (proverbs) except as details characterizing the folk." Here John Lyly's *Euphues* might well have been mentioned as probably the most conspicuous exception to this statement with its qualifications.<sup>1</sup> Among the several hundred proverbs used by way of illustration, I have noted seven Shakespearean proverbs that should be included in collections of Shakespeare's proverbs. I give them in a foot-note.<sup>2</sup>

There should be included in the bibliography on Weather Proverbs the series of papers in *The Classical Weekly* on classical weather lore by Dr. Eugene S. McCartney, in which have been

<sup>1</sup> An interesting problem in connection with Lyly's proverbs would be to determine which of his proverb-like sayings, not yet identified as English or foreign proverbs, are translations and which are of his own invention. It is recognized that he was skillful in imitating the form of proverbs, and also that he drew upon foreign collections for a number of his proverbs, but work is still to be done on a considerable body of proverb-like sayings in *Euphues*, to determine whether they are, as assumed, his own, or whether they are translations of little known foreign proverbs.

<sup>2</sup> (P. 7) "Two are an army against one." Cf. 3 *Henry VI* (II, i, 53): "But Hercules himself must yield to odds." This is a classical proverb found in Erasmus, s. v. *cedendum multitudini*, "Ne Hercules quidem aduersus duos." (P. 13) "It's ill halting before a cripple." *Pass. Pilg.*, 308, "A cripple soon can find a halt." (P. 26) "Each man for himself." See *Tempest* (V. i. 256), in which we have Stephano's drunken perversion of Heywood's "Shift each one for himself" (Farmer ed., 96). (P. 91) "He that bulls the cow must keep the calf." This proverb is alluded to in *King John* (I, i, 123): "In sooth, good friend, your father might have kept this calf bred from his cow, from all the world." (P. 93) "One man is no man." The more common form of this proverb in English is, "One is no number." It is alluded to in *Romeo and Juliet* (I, ii, 32-3): "Which on more view, of many being one, May stand in number, though in reckoning none." Compare Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, Sest. I, "One is no number; maids are nothing then, Without the sweet society of man." (P. 18) "To sell the skin before you have caught the bear." Alluded to in *Henry V.* (IV, iii, 93), with the substitution of 'lion' for 'bear.' (P. 26) "Clothes make the man." Erasmus has it, "Vestis virum facit." It is alluded to in *King Lear* (II, ii, 256) in the variant form, "The tailor makes a man." See also *All's Well* (II, v, 16) and *Cymbeline* (IV, ii, 80).

incorporated many Greek and Roman weather signs, sayings, and proverbs.<sup>3</sup>

Those interested in proverbs are in Professor Taylor's debt for this concise and scholarly study of the proverb. It surveys the field admirably and is especially helpful in its suggestions as to profitable investigations that have yet to be undertaken in the comparative study of proverbs. I know of no other equally stimulating and systematic study of the proverb.

M. P. TILLEY

*University of Michigan*

---

*The Owl and the Nightingale, Sources, Date, Author.* By KATHRYN HUGANIR. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931.

Dr. Huganir gives us a very interesting discussion of "the King's peace," the poet's reference to which<sup>4</sup> she thinks can have been written only in the reign of Henry the Second.<sup>5</sup> She offers interesting remarks on the purpose of the author of the *Owl*, whom she identifies with Nicholas of Guildford, and with a certain Nicholas son of Thorold.<sup>6</sup> She points out that some kinds of foxes climb trees,<sup>7</sup> which, much to my surprise, I find well-attested for the American gray fox. Has this any bearing on the fox hanging "by the bough"?<sup>8</sup> Dr. Huganir has no mean knowledge of medieval Latin, and illustrates her subject from that source with very considerable success. I cannot, however, accept her assurance that the author of the *Owl* "certainly knew" the work of Marie de France.<sup>9</sup> She catches me in a curious error concerning a Latin distich which is properly of interest only as expressing an antithesis between owl and nightingale.<sup>10</sup> Partly as a result of her dissertation, I am inclined to modify or withdraw certain details of my theory concerning the poet's connection with Cardinal Vivian's embassy in Scotland: to withdraw my identification of Nicholas of Guildford with the clerk of the Bishop of Winchester; to leave Peter of St. Agatha out of the discussion; to identify very

<sup>3</sup> *The Classical Weekly*, 14, 89-93, 97-100; 16. 3-7; 17. 105-108; 18. 154-157, 163-166; 20. 43-49, 51-54; 22. 25-31, 33-37; 23. 2-8, 11-15; 24. 11-16, 18-24, 25-29.

<sup>4</sup> *Owl*, 1733.

<sup>5</sup> Huganir, pp. 81-96.

<sup>6</sup> Huganir, pp. 140 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Huganir, pp. 17-18.

<sup>8</sup> *Owl*, v. 816.

<sup>9</sup> Huganir, p. 23.

<sup>10</sup> Huganir, p. 20; *PMLA*. XLIV, p. 344, footnote 42.

tentatively of course, the legate referred to as *sum from Rome*<sup>8</sup> with Cardinal Paparo, who in 1151 visited Scotland as well as Ireland, or at least Tynemouth which was then subject to the King of Scots.<sup>9</sup> *Sum from Rome* can hardly mean a legate to Norway.

Dr. Huganir's dissertation may serve us well in calling attention to the importance of studying the Nightingale's description of Ireland, Scotland, Norway and Galloway;<sup>10</sup> but I am quite unable to accept her contention that the poet is especially interested in Norway, or that he had not visited Ireland and Scotland. Adequate discussion is impossible here, but I will suggest that the sentences cited by Atkins and Dr. Huganir from Alred's *Orosius* do not describe Norwegians;<sup>11</sup> neither is it at all certain that our poet knew Alfred's *Orosius*. On the other hand the remark of Giraldus Cambrensis that there are no nightingales in Ireland does not prove that this was generally known in England or that our poet did not learn about the absence of the nightingale from Ireland and Scotland from actual travel in those countries.<sup>12</sup> I cannot believe that he met his "chattering" Irish priest outside of Ireland; and in *Owl*, 1757-1758 I prefer to take *in to Scotlonde* as meaning "in Scotland" (see N. E. D. under *Into III*, B-T. Suppl. under *in-tō VII*) and not to regard the couplet as "a playful exaggeration."<sup>13</sup> As at present advised I would date the *Owl* 1177-1178, soon after Cardinal Vivian's recall from Scotland, and not more than five years after England was invaded by Scots and Galwegians in 1173. Dr. Huganir absolutely fails to show that it was written during or immediately after the sojourn in England from 1181 till 1183 of Archbishop Eystein of Trondhjem.

HENRY BARRETT HINCKLEY

New Haven, Connecticut

*The Medieval Sciences in the Works of John Gower.* By GEORGE G. FOX. Princeton: University Press, 1931.

One function of scholarly research, we may suppose, is to reintegrate for us the psychological conditions which produced a work of literary art in the past. Situations at variance with those familiar to us and a content often foreign to our experience must

<sup>8</sup> *Owl*, v. 1016. With *Owl*, vv. 1017-1018 one may perhaps cf. *Four Masters sub anno 1151*.

<sup>9</sup> Anderson, *Early Sources of Scottish History*, II, pp. 212-213 footnote.

<sup>10</sup> *Owl*, 905-1042; Huganir, 98 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Huganir, p. 108.

<sup>12</sup> Huganir, p. 99.

<sup>13</sup> Huganir, pp. 103 and 149 footnote, follows Hall, *Selections from Early Middle English*, p. 578.

be recreated historically before the work allows itself to be understood and properly criticized. The scholar is justified in examining the nature of the things presented in a piece of literature and in showing their relations to each other and to the historical facts of the age which produced it. Professor Fox's study mentioned above offers an admirable example of this sort of historical research.

This author's main purpose is to make the scientific portions of Gower's writings more intelligible to the modern reader and to ascertain the importance of science in the poet's thought. Since Gower's references to science are often fragmentary, it becomes necessary to reproduce an entire background of scientific principle before they can be understood. Accordingly, the author has given for each of the more important mediaeval sciences a brief, but very respectable, account of the leading doctrines, with which Gower's treatment may be compared. Here are chapters on nature and fortune, the microcosm and the macrocosm, on astrology, dreams, alchemy, and magic. The best chapters are those dealing with alchemy—he who can state clearly any principle of mediaeval alchemy deserves our admiration!—and with correspondences between Gower's writings and various manuscripts of Alchandrus. Here the author has made a real contribution to our knowledge of the mediaeval sciences.

Gower's knowledge of the sciences, one gathers from reading this study, was neither profound nor vital. His mind was almost completely non-speculative; except in the case of alchemy and in his theory of the microcosm, where he is interested to some extent in general principles, he contents himself with recording unrelated and barely understood facts. Gower as a scientist appears to great disadvantage, and as an artist attempting to make use of scientific materials he seems to succeed in rendering himself more boresome than usual.

Still, one cannot help feeling that Professor Fox is inclined to patronize Gower. Such a state of mind occasionally betrays him into convicting Gower of contradictions where possibly none exists. For example, the poet is made to deny Fortune. But here he is only trying in his bungling way to say that Fortune-as-chance does not exist; Fortune is the result of a chain of cause and effect, the first of the series being unknown to us. And in this contention the poet is supported by Boethius, Aquinas, and other mediaeval thinkers. Again, Professor Fox is impatient because Gower, knowing from reading and experience that some dreams have no significance, still tells stories in which a supernatural being shows man the future in dreams. But here is no contradiction. Everybody in Gower's time, so far as I know, admitted that some dreams are divinely sent as harbingers of coming events, but that others are without significance. Gower records both kinds. His predilection is for the *somnium coeleste*, but he nowhere indicates that divinity is the sole and immediate cause of dreams.

On the whole, however, this work is an excellently written and carefully prepared piece of research in a most difficult field. It is entirely worthy of the Princeton stamp on it.

WALTER CLYDE CURRY

Vanderbilt University

---

*The Poems of John Audelay.* Edited by ELLA KEATS WHITING.

London: 1931. Pp. xl + 324. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, 184).

With the appearance of a complete, well-organized, and workmanlike edition of his writings John Audelay of Haghmond Abbey, "first priest" to a fifteenth-century Lord Strange, at last attains the full dignity of a minor poet of a minor period. Since 1844, when Halliwell printed a few of the poems for the Percy Society with the comment that the unique manuscript containing them was "scarcely worthy of being published entire," only partial and inaccurate texts of his work have been available for the student, and what attention it has had has been concentrated on its Shropshire dialect and on the group of carols near the end of the manuscript. It must be admitted that this fuller publication is not likely to lead to any great shift of emphasis. The long didactic poems which make up the bulk of the volume display more of industry and piety than of inspiration or poetic skill, but they leave the reader with a definite admiration for the author's sincere faith and desire for righteousness, while the love of children which appears, a little awkwardly, in the "Cantalena de puericia" adds a welcome touch to Audelay's self-portrait.

Not all the poems are certainly of Audelay's own composition, as Professor Whiting points out. No. 16 is found in the earlier Vernon Manuscript, and the differences of style, metre, and vocabulary between Nos. 53 and 54, on the Paternoster and the legend of the three dead kings, respectively, and the rest of Audelay's collection are so great as to have justified the editor in a stronger denial of his authorship than she actually makes. Audelay's tendency to abjectness is noticeably absent from both, as are the rather lame parentheses and intensive clichés or tags which are frequent in his verse. There is also reason to doubt whether a number of the carols which appear in other manuscripts are original with Audelay, e. g., Nos. 38, 44, 45, and some pronouncement from the editor on this question would have been welcome.

The text itself is well and, except for a very few slips, accurately edited. The manuscript is not always easy to read and has been much corrected, thereby imposing on a scrupulous editor a consider-

able body of textual notes. Professor Whiting has done good service in correcting the many misreadings of Chambers and Sidgwick in their previous editing of the carols, and of Storck and Jordan in their text of "De tribus regibus mortuis." In two cases, however, No. 37, l. 14, and No. 39, l. 50, careful examination of the manuscript seems to uphold Chambers and Sidgwick's readings, "fel" and "habud," against Professor Whiting's. I have noted a few other places where the editor's eye does not agree with mine, but only in the following is the sense of a passage involved:

No. 44, l. 27 should certainly read "Til kyngys iij," the first word being quite legible.

No. 47, l. 14, I read "Euer fro þe fynd," etc.

No. 51, l. 41, I read "To þi Sun fore me þou pray."

No. 42, heading, I read "In die epephanie."

In No. 50 a space should separate the first two lines, the burden, from the first stanza, as in the other carols. No. 46, l. 22, "þat þou bryng vs into þi bal," seems to demand emendation to "hal," a common expression for heaven. "Bal" in the sense of sphere and so applied is not recorded in the OED.

The notes are generally good and give many compact references to illustrative material in other medieval literature. The comment on Audelay's choice of St. Francis as a subject seems to imply that he was himself an Augustinian, whereas, as Chambers and Sidgwick point out, he may well have been only a secular priest and a boarder in the Abbey infirmary. No. 2, ll. 430-1 show, moreover, that Audelay was not blinded by jealousies to the merits of the founders of the mendicant orders. The note on No. 45, l. 4, "emne," might have taken account of the solution of the difficulty offered by the Balliol 354 text of the carol printed by Dyboski.

The section of the introduction devoted to the language of the poems is sufficiently full for the ordinary reader and is more perspicuously arranged than is always the case with such material. The whole edition is one which ought to gratify the shade of the meticulous Audelay, who in his colophon curses as for sacrilege any who damage his text, but freely offers a copy to any who ask for it properly.

RICHARD L. GREENE

*The University of Rochester*

---

*Hrafnkels Saga Freysgoda.* Edited with Introduction and Glossary by Professor F. STANTON CAWLEY. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1932. Pp. 1 + 82.

This edition of the *Hrafnkels saga freysgoda* is a welcome addition to the few Old Norse sagas edited in English. The author has well understood the nature of his task; he is everywhere clear and to the point; his discussions are brief but sufficiently comprehensive for the purpose. The reviewer feels this work to be an excellent combination of European scholarship and American practical sense.

The *Introduction* (XIII-L) contains first ("The Story of Hrafnkel Frey's Priest") a brief discussion of the nature of the Old Norse saga and an analysis of the *Hrafnkels saga* as to its contents and literary value. This is done with good taste and appreciation. Then follows a chapter ("Syntactical Observations") devoted to an analysis of syntactical peculiarities of the saga style (with references to the text) based chiefly on the authority of Heusler and Nygaard. This chapter (so far as syntax is concerned) takes the place of footnotes, which are entirely lacking in the text. The reviewer feels that this innovation is a mistake. The time-honored method of footnotes (so successfully pursued by the *Saga-Bibliothek*) enables the student to read the discussion of a passage in direct connection with the passage itself, which cannot be done according to Professor Cawley's method. By omitting footnotes and inserting a syntactical outline the author compels the student to search for a connection between grammar and text and how is the student to know when syntactical peculiarities appear unless a footnote is provided?

The *Glossary* is particularly well done. It is extremely comprehensive; references are made to the passages where the various meanings of the words occur; occasional parallels to Modern German constructions are cited; and the Gothic etymological equivalent of the Old Norse word is given—an excellent innovation. Regarding the Gothic etymological equivalents the author distinguishes between the corresponding Gothic form and a related Gothic form (in which case the text reads "cf. Goth."). There are a few inaccuracies here, e. g.: "fótr (*Goth. fótus*)" should read (*cf. Goth. fótus*)—ON *fótr* is not an *u*-stem—; "óvarr (*cf. Goth.-war*)" and "varr (*Goth. wars*)" are contradictory—since the Gothic form *war* or *wars* (nom. sing. masc.) does not appear, both ON *óvarr* and *varr* could better be referred to (*cf. Goth. war-ei*).

There are practically no misprints to mar the beautiful appearance of the book. The maps and photostatic reproduction of a part of the text enhance both the usefulness and the attractiveness of the whole work. The reviewer feels that we in America who are

interested in the advancement of the study of Old Norse literature and language owe a real debt to Professor Cawley for this scholarly and painstaking work.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

*University of Kansas*

*Scientific Thought in Poetry.* By RALPH B. CRUM. Columbia University Press, 1931. Pp. viii + 246. \$3.00.

A painful example of academic book-making—not unusual, alas! The author has written—at the length of 238 pages—on a most provoking subject, without finding anything to say. In an introductory chapter he tells us “many of the Romanticists feel—and surely not without cause—that the analytical method of the scientist tends to destroy beauty of expression, while the procedure of generalizing and abstracting deprives poetry of its concrete and sensuous qualities. This is also the attitude of the philosophers Schopenhauer and Croce” (p. 3). And that “The process of converting a truth into an image is what the poet means by ‘imagination’,” (p. 15) with here a footnote to Dewey. These specimens, I think most teachers will agree, show just that ‘acquaintance with the philosophy of the subject’ which most precludes any more intimate understanding. He then goes on to summarise, with translations, the most ‘scientific’ pages of Lucretius, and comments, “It must be clear from the consideration of these examples, that Lucretius possessed a keen eye for picturesque effect . . . His word pictures are not in any sense hackneyed.” ‘Nice things,’ indeed, to say about a great poet! In chapter III he puts together a little collection of passages from seventeenth-century poets illustrating the fact that they were “not indifferent to the scientific movement.” “Along with the growth of science in the seventeenth century went an increasing tendency to question many values which had been merely accepted before. About the middle of the century Robert Herrick declared:

Putrefaction is the end  
Of all that Nature doth entend.” (p. 55)

Startling evidence indeed of novelty introduced by science! Again, “If the spirit of the age tended to make some of the poets more analytical, they desired nevertheless to bring a certain order out of chaos. Note William Walsh’s questioning analysis of love:

Love is a medley of endearments, jars,  
Suspicions, quarrels, reconcilements, wars;  
Then peace again, Oh would it not be best  
To chase the fatal poison from our breast?” (p. 58)

Later chapters deal in a not dissimilar way with science in Voltaire, Chénier, Erasmus Darwin, Goethe, Tennyson, Meredith, Davidson and others. Of Davidson, "Surely the Darwinian theory of natural selection with all its worst ethical implications could go no further than that—none had expressed it so boldly as Davidson, so entirely without flinching; and yet it seems rather significant that with such a philosophy he was a very unhappy man and ended his life by committing suicide" (p. 237).

We may be tempted to think that such naivety and banality are due to insufficient scholarship or experience. But the author has clearly read far more than many young people who can be trusted to detect and avoid it. We can come nearer to the diagnosis by asking "To whom is the book addressed?" The answer is "To examiners!" It seems to be the product of much listening to lectures and a stage on the vicious circle leading to more lectures. The evil effect of this sort of thing on the teaching of literature must be my excuse for treating a not exceptionally unsatisfactory book over-harshly. Critical standards are perhaps at the moment more threatened by Universities than by any other influences.

I. A. RICHARDS

*Cambridge University*

---

*Studies in English*, by MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO. Collected by PRINCIPAL MALCOLM W. WALLACE. The University of Toronto Press, 1931. Pp. 254. \$2.50.

These six studies in English, ranging from Swift to Matthew Arnold, are dedicated to Professor W. J. Alexander, who had been in Toronto University from 1889 to 1926 and before that, as this reviewer well and gratefully remembers, in Dalhousie College. The first four studies lead from the complete neo-classicism of Swift's poetry through the pre-romanticism of Collins into the romanticism of Coleridge and Shelley; the last two are on the "Inhibitions of Browning's Poetry" and the "French Reputation of Matthew Arnold." Mr. Herbert Davis traces the development of Swift's poetry from imitation of Cowley through the violent anti-romantic satire of "Strephon and Chloe" to the triumph of the comic spirit in "Judgment Day." In the longest essay in the volume Mr. A. S. P. Woodhouse discusses the meaning and the place of the imagination in the poetry of the eighteenth century with particular reference to the odes of Collins. He demonstrates anew that not all the poetry of this period was the work of reason but that the imagination was a powerful force in all the great poems of the century, whether they were neo-classical or early romantic. Incidentally, it might be remarked that Mr. Woodhouse gives a much

more plausible interpretation of Collins's "Ode to the Poetical Character" than Mr. Garrod does in his treatment of this poem. Mr. J. R. MacGillivray independently confirms and supplements the results of Sister Eugenia's researches (*PMLA.*, XLV, 1069 ff.) concerning the enquiries Coleridge and his fellow pantisocrats made about the possibilities of comfortable settlement on the banks of the Susquehanna, and with her finally puts to rest the old legend that the place was chosen because of its euphonious name. Mr. G. S. Brett's essay on "Shelley's Relation to Berkeley and Drummond" links up Shelley's "immaterial philosophy" with Berkeley's idealistic theories as they came through the "Academical Questions" of Sir William Drummond, and he traces the influence of this book not only in Shelley's ideas but also in his phrases. Browning could not speak out in his own person in matters of religious belief, or if he did, he did so rather feebly, but in his dramatic characters he uttered their convictions with all the power of his genius. So thinks Mr. J. F. MacDonald in his study on the "Inhibitions of Browning's Poetry." The final essay, by Mr. E. K. Brown, would seem to demonstrate that the French reputation of Matthew Arnold was hardly worth investigating.

JAMES W. TUPPER

*Lafayette College*

### BRIEF MENTION

*Presiding Ideas in Wordsworth's Poetry.* By MELVIN M. RADER. Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1931. (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, VIII, 2, pp. 121-216). This slender volume is a view of the chief philosophical ingredients of Wordsworth's poetry as seen by a well-trained student of philosophy. Professor Rader is a member of the department of philosophy at the University of Washington and those who have less accurate knowledge of the course of philosophical thought in the eighteenth century and earlier will find his monograph a valuable analysis. Included are discussions of the various stages of the development of Wordsworth's personality, Wordsworth's transcendentalism, the influence of Hartley, of Kant, and of Plato, and Wordsworth's theory of the external world. Of especial interest is the discussion of the poet's animism and its probable sources. Along with other recent writers, Professor Rader is inclined to see the predominance of Coleridge in "shaping the philosophical tenets of his friend. Coleridge with his

wealth of philosophical knowledge and an eager proselytizing spirit" came just at the critical time in the development of Wordsworth's thinking, when he was yearning for new light. As Coleridge's philosophy grew and changed, so did that of his fellow poet. As the author indicates, this growth included the overthrow of necessitarianism, the revision of the views of association, the adoption of a transcendental solution of the problem of knowledge, and the change from pantheism to immanent theism.

JOHN D. REA

*Miami University*

*The Later Genesis (and other Old English and Old Saxon Texts relating to the Fall of Man)*, edited by FRIEDRICH KLAEBER. [Englische Textbibliothek, herausgegeben von Dr. Johannes Hoopes, No. 15] New Edition, with Supplement. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Pp. 12 (supplement) + 69. M. 2 (kart).

The reprinting of this well known collection of excerpts on the theme of the Fall reminds us of the availability of this inexpensive but carefully edited series (*Englische Textbibliothek*) for use in the second year of instruction in Old and Middle English. The present number has long been the standard approach to one of the themes of OE literature. The pieces included are the OE *Genesis B*, *Genesis A* 852-964, *Christ and Satan* 410-31, 470-494, *Guthlac* 791-843, 949-69, *Phoenix*, 393-423, 437-42, *Christ* 1379-1418, *Juliana* 494-505; and the OS *Genesis* 1-26, *Heliand* 1030-49, 3588-3609.

In form and appearance, it is an exact replica of the 1913 edition, with the compact but rich Bibliography, Notes, and Glossary that we associate with Mr. Klaeber's method. If it can be said that the apparatus for study is unattractive to the elementary students for whom it is intended, and often condensed to the point of being cryptic, it can also be said that it will serve as a stimulus to the intellectual curiosity of the best ones and as a permanent standard for scholars who deal with these selections.

The Supplement of eight pages, awkwardly placed at the beginning of the book, brings up to date the Bibliography, Notes, and Glossary. But one should not expect here a complete assimilation of the many pertinent items of scholarship that have appeared since 1913. Mr. Klaeber's reaction, for example, on certain points discussed by Gollancz and by Krapp in the introductions and notes to their recent editions of *Junius XI* would be eagerly read; but since only the merest mention is made of them, we are reminded that the work is primarily a textbook for college classes.

G. W. SMALL

*University of Maine*

*La Littérature Anglaise.* By PAUL DOTTIN. Paris, Colin, 1931. Pp. 209 (*Collection Armand Colin*, no. 146). Professor Dottin has designed not a history, but a guide for his fellow-countrymen among those British authors whose fame is not bounded by the mere interest and erudition of scholars. Though he begins with what he calls "la nuit anglo-saxonne," half his little book is occupied with the last one hundred and fifty years, a fourth with the last fifty, and eight pages with his idol, Shelley.

It is doubtless salutary for us at times to view English literature through the Gallic eye; to descry new values by its clairvoyance, and also to mark its points of myopia. For example, to Mr. Dottin, as already to Mr. Legouis, English poetry is naught till it enjoys French influence. Old English poems, says Mr. Dottin, "n'ont aucune importance pour l'historien des littératures." Perhaps he speaks only for France when he says that Jane Austen's novels are no longer read; or that Browning is only the hero of a small group, one third intellectuals, two thirds snobs. He states gossip for a fact when he says that Stella was Temple's natural daughter, and that Swift married her. But almost every page releases a just and lively sentence that sets one pondering. "Milton commence à devenir un objet de musée autour duquel se battent des savants." Tom Moore has been unjustly forgotten perhaps because his *Irish Melodies* "sont trop souvent infligées au visiteur par la jeune fille de la maison." After Swinburne, "la poésie s'effaça derrière le roman, et ne fut plus qu'un luxe destiné aux élites." Of Shaw: "Peut-être y a-t-il un homme qui souffre derrière le masque grimaçant du comédien."

CHARLES G. OSGOOD

Princeton University

The Bowdoin prize essay of Harvard University, "The Broken Column" by Harry Levin, is a clever undergraduate survey of romantic Hellenism through the latter part of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth. It is all very discouraging: Byron is a "weary Titan, chained to his *papier-mâché* Caucasus by shackles of his own forging, with the tragic fire eternally preying on his heart"; "Shelley, to put it baldly, is all fire and air, without much fire"; "Keats is the laureate of bric-à-brac."

JAMES W. TUPPER

Lafayette College